


**DR. BABASAHEB AMBEDKAR  
WRITINGS AND SPEECHES**

**Vol. 3**









**Dr. BABASAHEB AMBEDKAR**

**BORN : 14 th April 1891**

**PARINIRVAN : 6 th December 1956**

**DR. BABASAHEB AMBEDKAR**  
**WRITINGS AND SPEECHES**  
**VOL. 3**

Compiled  
by  
VASANT MOON



EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA  
1987

*14th April 1987*

©

**Government of Maharashtra,**

**First Edition : 15,000 Copies**

**Price: Rs. 40.00**

*Publisher :*

**The Education and Employment Department**

**Government of Maharashtra.**

**Bombay 400 032.**

**For Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source**

**Material Publication Committee**

*Printer :*

**The Manager,**

**Government Photozinco Press,**

**Photozinco Road,**


**Pune 411 001.**

## FOREWORD

Dr. Ambedkar, the Chief Architect of Indian Constitution, is well-known not only as a constitutionalist and a parliamentarian but also as a scholar and active reformer all over the world. As a champion of the down-trodden he waged relentless struggle against the oppressive features of Hindu society. Throughout his life, he strove for establishment of a new social order based on the principles of liberty, equality, justice and universal brotherhood.

The Indian society owes a tremendous debt to his radical and humanitarian approach for solution of the problems of the Backward Classes.

The Government of Maharashtra is committed to the welfare of the backward classes for whose uplift Dr. Ambedkar dedicated his whole life. Thoughts and teachings of great men like Dr. Ambedkar will always serve as a beacon light for the new generation. Our Government, therefore, feels proud and happy to bring out these three consecutive volumes of his unpublished writings as part of our total project of publication of the writings of Dr. Ambedkar.



(S. B. CHAVAN)

*Chief Minister of Maharashtra*



## PREFACE


I consider it a great honour to have been asked to write a preface to these volumes which consist of hitherto unpublished writings of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar.

Dr. Ambedkar occupies a position of high eminence among the learned scholars of Indian society and philosophy. His erudition and learning as reflected through his writings may serve as a beacon light for rational approach towards our social and religious problems.

The Government of Maharashtra has undertaken the work of bringing out complete writings of Dr. Ambedkar in a series of volumes. The reconstituted Committee appointed for this work, has now come up with three consecutive volumes of the unpublished writings, which were very eagerly awaited by the students of India's social and political evolution.

The present volumes, which deal with philosophical as well as social problems of Indian society, may prove interesting to the scholars as well as to the new and young generation which is eager to find solutions to the national problems on a rational basis.

The Editorial Board is to be congratulated for the zeal, dedication and care which they brought to bear on the expeditious publication of these volumes.



(Prof. RAM MEGHE)  
*Minister for Education,  
Maharashtra State*





**Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source Material Publication  
Committee, Maharashtra State**

**EDITORS**

- |  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1. Hon'ble Prof. RAM MEGHE<br><i>Minister for Education.</i>               | .. President                  |
| 2. Hon'ble Kum. CHANDRIKA KENIYA<br><i>Minister of State for Education</i> | .. Vice-President             |
| 3. Shri R. S. GAVAI<br><i>Member of the Legislative Council</i>            | .. Vice-President             |
| 4. Shri B. C. KAMBLE   | .. Member.                    |
| 5. Dr. P. T. BORALE  | .. Member.                    |
| 6. Dr. V. B. KOLTE   | .. Member.                    |
| 7. Shri. GHANASHYAM TALVATKAR  | .. Member.                    |
| 8. Shri. SHANKARRAO KHARAT   | .. Member.                    |
| 9. Smt. SHANTABAI DANI   | .. Member.                    |
| 10. Shri PRAKASH Y. AMBEDKAR   | .. Member.                    |
| 11. Shri. R. R. BHOLE  | .. Member.                    |
| 12. Shri. S. S. REGE   | .. Member.                    |
| 13. Dr. BHALCHANDRA PHADKE   | .. Member.                    |
| 14. Shri. BABURAO BAGUL  | .. Member.                    |
| 15. Shri. DAYA PAWAR   | .. Member.                    |
| 16. Prof. ARUN KAMBLE  | .. Member.                    |
| 17. Prof. RAMAKANT YADAV   | .. Member.                    |
| 18. Shri. WAMAN NIMBALKAR  | .. Member.                    |
| 19. Secretary, Education Department  | .. Member.                    |
| 20. Director of Education, M. S., Pune                                     | .. Member.<br>Secretary.      |
| 21. Shri VASANT MOON   | .. Officer on<br>Special Duty |



## INTRODUCTION

The members of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source Material Publication Committee are pleased to present this volume of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar's unpublished writings to readers on behalf of the Government of Maharashtra. This volume is significant and unique in several respects. Firstly, the contents of this volume were hitherto unknown. These are the unpublished writings of Dr. Ambedkar which were in the custody of the Administrator General and the custodian of Dr. Ambedkar's property. The students of Dr. Ambedkar's writings and his devoted followers were anxious to read these writings. Some of the followers of Dr. Ambedkar had even gone to the court to secure permission for the printing of these writings although the manuscripts were not in their possession. Thus, these writings had assumed such significance that it was even feared that they had been destroyed or lost.

There is a second reason why this volume is significant. Dr. Ambedkar is known for his versatile genius, but his interpretation of the philosophy of and his historical analysis of the Hindu religion as expressed in these pages may throw new light on his thought.

The third important point is that Dr. Ambedkar's analysis of Hindu Philosophy is intended not as an intellectual exercise but as a definite approach to the strengthening of the Hindu society on the basis of the human values of equality, liberty and fraternity. The analysis ultimately points towards uplifting the down-trodden and absorbing the masses in the national mainstream.

It would not be out of place to note down a few words about the transfer of these papers to the Committee for publication. During his life time, Dr. Ambedkar published many books, but also planned many others. He had also expressed his intention to write his autobiography, the life of Mahatma Phule and the History of the Indian Army, but left no record of any research on these subjects.

After his death, in 1956, all the papers including his unpublished writings were taken into custody by the custodian of the High Court of Delhi. Later, these papers were transferred to the Administrator General of the Government of Maharashtra. Since then, the boxes containing the unpublished manuscripts of Dr. Ambedkar and several other papers were in the custody of the Administrator General.

It was learned that Shri J. B. Bansod, an Advocate from Nagpur, had filed a suit against the Government in the High Court Bench at Nagpur,

which was later transferred to the High Court of Judicature at Bombay. The petitioner had made a simple request seeking permission from the court to either allow him to publish the unpublished writings of Dr. Ambedkar or to direct the Government to publish the same as they had assumed national significance. This litigation was pending before the Bombay High Court for several years.

After the formation of this Committee and after the appointment of Shri V. W. Moon as Officer on Special Duty in 1978, it was felt necessary to secure the unpublished writings of Dr. Ambedkar and to publish them as material of historical importance. Shri Moon personally contacted the legal heirs of Dr. Ambedkar and the Administrator General. Shri Bansod, Advocate, was also requested to cooperate. It must be noted with our appreciation that Smt. Savita B. Ambedkar, Shri Prakash Y. Ambedkar and his family members and Shri Bansod, Advocate, all showed keen interest, consented to the Government project for publication and agreed to transfer all the boxes containing the Ambedkar papers to the Government. At last, the Administrator General agreed to transfer all the papers contained in five iron trunks to this Committee. Accordingly, Shri Vasant Moon took possession of the boxes on behalf of the Government of Maharashtra on 18-9-1981. All the five trunks are since stored safely in one of the Officers' Chambers in the Education Department of Mantralaya.

Shri M. B. Chitnis, who, as a close associate of Dr. Ambedkar, was intimately familiar with the latter's handwriting. He was at that time Chairman of the Editorial Board. On receipt of the papers, he spent a fortnight identifying which of the papers were Dr. Ambedkar's manuscripts. This basic process of identification having been accomplished, there remained the stupendous task of reading, interpreting and collating the vast range of MS material in the collection, to decide in what form and in what order it should be presented to the public.

In 1981, Shri. Moon, OSD, set to work on this project. This work of matching and sorting was a delicate and difficult one as well as immensely time-consuming. Many of the works what Dr. Ambedkar had evidently intended to complete, were scattered here and there in an incomplete state in the manuscript form. It was therefore necessary to retrieve and collate the fragments in order to place them in proper order. Only after very many hours of reading, selecting and reflecting not only on the contents of these papers but also what was already known of Dr. Ambedkar's work and thought, did Shri. Moon arrive at the present selection and arrangement of those MS.

This task was not merely strenuous at the intellectual level but also at the physical one due to the condition of the papers themselves. These had been stored in the closed boxes for more than 30 years. They were fumigated with insecticides, with the result that a most poisonous foul odour emitted from these papers. Shri Moon and his staff had to suffer infection of the skin and eyes and required medical treatment.

After two years of strenuous work, Shri Moon had submitted a detailed report to the Editorial Board on 17-9-83 containing recommendations as to the proper arrangement and presentation of the papers as they were to appear in a published form. The present volume is substantially in accordance with these recommendations.

In the execution of this laborious work, invaluable assistance was rendered by the Stenographers Shri Anil Kavale and Shri L. R. Meher, and Shri S. A. Mungekar as a clerk.

After the proposed arrangements had been approved by the Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source Material Publication Editorial Committee in its meeting Dt. 23-9-86, Shri Moon and his staff took on the tasks associated with publication, i.e. proof reading and indexing.

In the papers that the Editorial Board scrutinised, we have come across 51 titles of unpublished writings (including 26 of 'Riddles in Hinduism'). In addition to these, we have received 14 unpublished essays of Dr. Ambedkar from Shri S. S. Rege, the Ex-Librarian of the Siddharth College, Bombay. The essays received from Shri Rege are shown by asterisk in the list mentioned below. Not all these essays are complete. All the essays have been divided into three volumes as under :—

#### VOLUME 3 :

1. Philosophy of Hinduism
2. The Hindu Social Order : Its Essential Principles
3. The Hindu Social Order : Its Unique Features
4. Symbols of Hinduism
5. Ancient India on Exhumation
6. The Ancient Regime—The State of the Aryan Society
7. A Sunken Priesthood
8. Reformers and Their Fate
- \*9. The Decline and Fall of Buddhism
10. The Literature of Brahminism
- \*11. The Triumph of Brahmanism
12. The Morals of the House—Manusmriti or the Gospel of Counter-Revolution
13. The Philosophic Defence of Counter-Revolution: Krishna and His Gita
14. Analytical notes of Virat Parva and Uddyog Parva

15. Brahmins V/s Kshatriyas
16. Shudras and the Counter-Revolution
17. The Woman and the Counter-Revolution
18. Buddha or Karl Marx
19. Schemes of books.

#### VOLUME 4 :

Riddles in Hinduism (27 Chapters including 1 from Shri S. S. Rege)

#### VOLUME 5 :

1. Untouchables or Children of India's Ghetto
- \*2. The House the Hindus have Built
- \*3. The Rock on which it is Built
- \*4. Why Lawlessness is Lawful ?
- \*5. Touchables Vs Untouchables
- \*6. Hinduism and the Legacy of Brahminism
- \*7. Parallel Cases
  8. Civilization or Felony
  9. The Origin of Untouchability
10. The Curse of Caste
- \*11. From Millions to Fractions
12. The Revolt of Untouchables
13. Held at Bay
14. Away from the Hindus
15. A Warning to the Untouchables
16. Caste and Conversion
- \*17. Christianizing the Untouchables
- \*18. The Condition of the Convert
- \*19. Under the Providence of Mr. Gandhi
- \*20. Gandhi and His Fast

In this Introduction we propose to deal with all the questions raised about these manuscripts in order to clear the air about the publication of all Dr. Ambedkar's extant writings.

It is generally believed by the followers of Dr. Ambedkar that Dr. Ambedkar had completed the books entitled : (1) Riddles of Hinduism, (2) The Buddha and Karl Marx and (3) Revolution and Counter-Revolution. The manuscripts of "Riddles of Hinduism" have been found in separate chapters bundled together in one file. These chapters contain corrections, erasures, alterations, etc. by the hands of Dr. Ambedkar himself. Fortunately, the introduction by Dr. Ambedkar is also available for this book. We, however, regret that the

final manuscript of this volume has not been found. The Committee has accepted the title "Riddles in Hinduism", given by Dr. Ambedkar in his Introduction to the Book.

"The Buddha and Karl Marx" was also said to have been completed by Dr. Ambedkar, but we have not come across such a book among the manuscripts. There is, however, a typed copy of a book entitled "Gautam the Buddha and Karl Marx" (A Critique and Comparative Study of their Systems of Philosophy) by LEUKE—Vijaya Publishing House, Colombo) (year of publication not mentioned). One short essay of 34 pages by Dr. Ambedkar entitled "Buddha or Karl Marx" was however found and being included in the third volume. A third book, viz., "Revolution and Counter-Revolution", was also believed to have been completed by Dr. Ambedkar. A printed scheme for this treatise has been found in the papers received by the Committee. It appears that Dr. Ambedkar had started working on various chapters simultaneously. Scattered pages have been found in the boxes and are gathered together.

We are tempted here to present the process of writing of Dr. Ambedkar which will give an idea of the colossal efforts he used to make in the writing of a book. He had had his own discipline. He used to make a blue-print of the book before starting the text. The Editorial Board found many such blue-prints designed by him, viz., "India and Communism", "Riddles in Hinduism", "Can I be a Hindu?", "Revolution and Counter-Revolution", "What Brahmins have done to the Untouchables", "Essays on Bhagvat Gita", "Buddha and Karl Marx", etc. But some of these were not even begun and those which were begun were left incomplete.

It will be interesting to present an illustration. Dr. Ambedkar had prepared a blue-print for a book entitled "India and Communism". The contents are as follows :

#### Part—I The Pre-requisites of Communism

Chapter 1—The Birth-place of Communism

Chapter 2—Communism & Democracy

Chapter 3—Communism & Social Order

#### Part—II India and the Pre-requisites of Communism

Chapter 4—The Hindu Social Order

Chapter 5—The Basis of the Hindu Social Order

Chapter 6—Impediments to Communism arising from the Social Order.

#### Part—III What then shall we do?

Chapter 1—Marx and the European Social Order

Chapter 2—Manu and the Hindu Social Order.

Dr. Ambedkar could complete only Chapters 4 and 5 of the scheme viz., "The Hindu Social Order" and "The Basis of the Hindu Social Order". It appears that when it struck to him that he should deal with two more topics in Part III he added those two topics in his own handwriting on the typed page. In the same well-bound file of typed material, there appears a page entitled "Can I be a Hindu?" which bears his signature in pencil and a table of contents on the next page as follows :

Introduction.

Symbols of Hinduism

Part-I—Caste

Part-II—Cults—Worship of Deities

Part-III—Superman.

The third page bears sub-titles of the chapters as follows :—

1. Symbols represent the soul of a thing
2. Symbols of Christianity
3. Symbols of Islam
4. Symbols of Jainism
5. Symbols of Buddhism
6. Symbols of Hinduism
7. What are the Symbols of Hinduism ?

*Three*

1. Caste.

2. Cults—

- (1) Rama
- (2) Krishna
- (3) Shiva
- (4) Vishnu

3. Service of Superman.

The plan as designed above remains incomplete except for the chapter on, "Symbols of Hinduism".

The Editorial Committee has found a chapter on "Riddles of Rama and Krishna" which might have been intended for the volume "Riddles in Hinduism". The 24 riddles as proposed in his original plan were changed often in blue-prints. The seriatim of the contents and chapters and the arrangement of the file do not synchronize. The chapter on Rama and Krishna did not find a place in the listing of the contents of the book. However, we are including it in the volume on Riddles.

At the end we are confident that our time and our pains will not go unrewarded when Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar's hitherto unpublished works will be brought in a proper form before the general public as well as interested scholars.



We place on record our deep sense of gratitude to Smt. Savita B. Ambedkar, Shri. Prakash Y. Ambedkar and his family members for granting permission to the Government for publication of all the writings of Dr. Ambedkar. Shri. Y. I. Desai, the Administrator General and Custodian of Dr. Ambedkar's Estate deserves our appreciation for transfer of the manuscripts to the Government. Shri. J. B. Bansod, an Advocate from Nagpur also deserves thanks for co-operating with the Committee. We record our deep appreciation of the Late Shri. M. B. Chitnis for sparing his valuable time, labour and guidance in his failing health.

We express our sincere gratitude to Shri Shankarrao Chavan, the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Prof. Ram Meghe, the Education Minister, and Miss Chandrika Keniya, the Minister of State for Education, Maharashtra State, for their decision to publish all the manuscripts. We thank Shri. R. S. Gavai, the Vice-President of the Committee and MLC for his initiative, guidance and invaluable efforts in solving the Committee's problems. We are also thankful to Shri. Madhusudan Kolhatkar, Secretary, Education Department, Maharashtra State, for his valuable advice. We thank Shri R. S. Jambhule, Director; Shri. S. A. Deokar, Joint Director; Shri. J. B. Kulkarni, Assistant Secretary; Shri. M. M. Awate, Deputy Director and Shri E. M. Meshram, Superintendent, all of the Education Department, for taking keen interest in the process of publication.

A special mention needs to be made of Dr. P. T. Borale, Shri S. S. Rege, Dr. B. D. Phadke and Shri Daya Pawar, Members of the Committee, who met together several times and made invaluable suggestions in the editing of this volume. We express our deep appreciation for their contribution.

Shri. S. S. Rege, a Member of this Committee, was kind enough to spare the manuscripts of 14 essays of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar which had been in his possession for many years. These essays have enriched the material included in these three volumes. The Members of the Committee are most indebted to Shri. Rege for his kindness.

Shri. R. B. Alva, the Director, Shri. G. D. Dhond, the Deputy Director, Shri. P. S. More, the Manager, Shri. A. C. Sayyad and Shri R. J. Mahatekar, the Dy. Managers, Shri. J. S. Nagvekar, Operator Film Setter, and the staff of the Department of Printing and Stationery deserve full appreciation and thanks for their expeditious printing with utmost care and sincerity.

## EDITORS

**Bombay**  
14th April 1987

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Source  
Material Publication Committee  
Maharashtra State



# CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword .. ..	(v)
Preface .. ..	(vii)
Introduction .. ..	(xi)
PART I	
Chapter 1 Philosophy of Hinduism . . .	3
PART II INDIA AND THE PRE-REQUISITES OF COMMUNISM	
Chapter 2 The Hindu Social Order—Its Essential Principles	95
Chapter 3 The Hindu Social Order—Its Unique Features	116
Chapter 4 Symbols of Hinduism .. ..	130
PART III REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION	
Chapter 5 Ancient India on Exhumation .. ..	151
Chapter 6 The Ancient Regime .. ..	153
Chapter 7 A Sunken Priesthood .. ..	158
Chapter 8 Reformers and Their Fate .. ..	165
Chapter 9 The Decline and Fall of Buddhism .. ..	229
Chapter 10 The Literature of Brahminism .. ..	239
Chapter 11 The Triumph of Brahminism .. ..	266
Chapter 12 The Morals of the House .. ..	332
Chapter 13 Krishna and His Gita .. ..	357
Chapter 14 Analytical Notes of Virat Parva and Udyog Parva	381
Chapter 15 Brahmins Versus Kshatriyas .. ..	392
Chapter 16 Shudras and the Counter-Revolution .. ..	416
Chapter 17 The Woman and the Counter-Revolution	429
PART IV	
Chapter 18 Buddha or Karl Marx .. ..	441
PART V	
Chapter 19 Schemes of Books .. ..	465



## PART I

---

### Philosophy of Hinduism

*This script on Philosophy of Hinduism was found as a well-bound copy which we feel is complete by itself. The whole script seems to be a Chapter of one big scheme. This foolscap original typed copy consists of 169 pages.—*  
Editors



# CHAPTER 1

## Philosophy of Hinduism

### I

What is the philosophy of Hinduism? This is a question which arises in its logical sequence. But apart from its logical sequence its importance is such that it can never be omitted from consideration. Without it no one can understand the aims and ideals of Hinduism.

It is obvious that such a study must be preceded by a certain amount of what may be called clearing of the ground and defining of the terms involved.

At the outset it may be asked what does this proposed title comprehend? Is this title of the Philosophy of Hinduism of the same nature as that of the Philosophy of Religion? I wish I could commit myself one way or the other on this point. Indeed I cannot. I have read a good deal on the subject, but I confess I have not got a clear idea of what is meant by Philosophy of Religion. This is probably due to two facts. In the first place while religion is something definite, there is nothing definite<sup>1</sup> as to what is to be included in the term philosophy. In the second place Philosophy and Religion have been adversaries if not actual antagonists as may be seen from the story of the philosopher and the theologian. According to the story, the two were engaged in disputation and the theologian accused the philosopher that he was "like a blind man in a dark room, looking for a black cat which was not there". In reply the philosopher charged the theologian saying that "he was like a blind man in the dark room, looking for a black cat which was not there but he declared to have found there". Perhaps it is the unhappy choice of the title—Philosophy of Religion—which is responsible for causing confusion in the matter of the exact definition of its field. The nearest approach to an intelligible statement as to the exact subject matter of Philosophy of Religion I find in Prof. Pringle-Pattison who observes<sup>2</sup> :—

<sup>1</sup> See Article on 'Philosophy' in Munro's *Encyclopaedia of Education*.

<sup>2</sup> The Philosophy of Religion. Oxf. pages 1-2.

“A few words may be useful at the outset as an indication of what we commonly mean by the Philosophy of Religion. Philosophy was described long ago by Plato as the synoptic view of things. That is to say, it is the attempt to see things together—to keep all the main features of the world in view, and to grasp them in their relation to one another as parts of one whole. Only thus can we acquire a sense of proportion and estimate aright the significance of any particular range of facts for our ultimate conclusions about the nature of the world-process and the world-ground. Accordingly, the philosophy of any particular department of experience, the Philosophy of Religion, the Philosophy of Art, the Philosophy of Law, is to be taken as meaning an analysis and interpretation of the experience in question in its bearing upon our view of man and the world in which he lives. And when the facts upon which we concentrate are so universal, and in their nature so remarkable, as those disclosed by the history of religion—the philosophy of man’s religious experience—cannot but exercise a determining influence upon our general philosophical conclusions. In fact with many writers the particular discussion tends to merge in the more general.”

“The facts with which a philosophy of religion has to deal are supplied by the history of religion, in the most comprehensive sense of that term. As Tiele puts it, “all religions of the civilized and uncivilised world, dead and living”, is a ‘historical and psychological phenomenon’ in all its manifestations. These facts, it should be noted, constitute the data of the philosophy of religion; they do not themselves constitute a ‘philosophy’ or, in Tiele’s use of the term, a ‘science’ of religion. ‘If’, he says, ‘I have minutely described all the religions in existence, their doctrines, myths and customs, the observances they inculcate, and the organization of their adherents, tracing the different religions from their origin to their bloom and decay, I have merely collected the materials with which the science of religion works’. ‘The historical record, however complete, is not enough; pure history is not philosophy. To achieve a philosophy of religion we should be able to discover in the varied manifestations a common principle to whose roots in human nature we can point, whose evolution we can trace by intelligible stages from lower to higher and more adequate forms, as well as its intimate relations with the other main factors in human civilization”.

If this is Philosophy of Religion it appears to me that it is merely a different name for that department of study which is called comparative religion with the added aim of discovering a common



principle in the varied manifestations of religion. Whatever be the scope and value of such a study, I am using the title Philosophy of Religion to denote something quite different from the sense and aim given to it by Prof. Pringle-Pattison. I am using the word Philosophy in its original sense which was two-fold. It meant teachings as it did when people spoke of the philosophy of Socrates or the philosophy of Plato. In another sense it meant critical reason used in passing judgments upon things and events. Proceeding on this basis Philosophy of Religion is to me not a merely descriptive science. I regard it as being both descriptive as well as normative. In so far as it deals with the teachings of a Religion, Philosophy of Religion becomes a descriptive science. In so far as it involves the use of critical reason for passing judgment on those teachings, the Philosophy of Religion becomes a normative science. From this it will be clear what I shall be concerned with in this study of the Philosophy of Hinduism. To be explicit I shall be putting Hinduism on its trial to assess its worth as a way of life.

Here is one part of the ground cleared. There remains another part to be cleared. That concerns the ascertainment of the factors concerned and the definitions of the terms I shall be using.

A study of the Philosophy of Religion it seems to me involves the determination of three dimensions. I call them dimensions because they are like the unknown quantities contained as factors in a product. One must ascertain and define these dimensions of the Philosophy of Religion if an examination of it is to be fruitful.

Of the three dimensions, Religion is the first. One must therefore define what he understands by religion in order to avoid argument being directed at cross purposes. This is particularly necessary in the case of Religion for the reason that there is no agreement as to its exact definition. This is no place to enter upon an elaborate consideration of this question. I will therefore content myself by stating the meaning in which I am using the word in the discussion which follows.

I am using the word Religion to mean Theology. This will perhaps be insufficient for the purposes of definition. For there are different kinds of Theologies and I must particularize which one I mean. Historically there have been two Theologies spoken of from ancient times. *Mythical* theology and *Civil* theology. The Greeks who distinguished them gave each a definite content. By Mythical theology they meant the tales of gods and their doings told in or implied by current imaginative literature. Civil theology according to them consisted of the knowledge of the various feasts and fasts of the State

Calendar and the ritual appropriate to them. I am not using the word theology in either of these two senses of that word. I mean by theology *natural theology*<sup>1</sup> which is the doctrine of God and the divine, as an integral part of the theory of nature. As traditionally understood there are three theses which 'natural theology' propounds. (1) That God exists and is the author of what we call nature or universe (2) That God controls all the events which make nature and (3) God exercises a government over mankind in accordance with his sovereign moral law.

I am aware there is another class of theology known as *Revealed Theology*—spontaneous self disclosure of divine reality—which may be distinguished from *Natural theology*. But this distinction does not really matter. For as has been pointed out<sup>2</sup> that a revelation may either "leave the results won by *Natural theology* standing without modifications, merely supplementing them by further knowledge not attainable by unassisted human effort" or it "may transform *Natural theology* in such a way that all the truths of natural theology would acquire richer and deeper meaning when seen in the light of a true revelation." But the view that a genuine *natural theology* and a genuine *revelational theology* might stand in real contradiction may be safely excluded as not being possible.

Taking the three theses of Theology namely (1) the existence of God, (2) God's providential government of the universe and (3) God's moral government of mankind, I take Religion to mean the propounding of an ideal scheme of divine governance the aim and object of which is to make the social order in which men live a moral order. This is what I understand by Religion and this is the sense in which I shall be using the term Religion in this discussion.

The second dimension is to know the ideal scheme for which a Religion stands. To define what is the fixed, permanent and dominant part in the religion of any society and to separate its essential characteristics from those which are unessential is often very difficult. The reason for this difficulty in all probability lies in the difficulty pointed out by Prof. Robertson Smith<sup>3</sup> when he says:—

"The traditional usages of religion had grown up gradually in the course of many centuries, and reflected habits of thought, characteristic of very diverse stages of man's intellectual and moral development. No conception of the nature of the gods could possibly afford the clue to all parts of that motley complex of rites and ceremonies which the later paganism had received by

<sup>1</sup> Natural Theology as a distinct department of study owes its origin to Plato—see Laws.

<sup>2</sup> A. E. Taylor. "The Faith of a Moralist" p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> The Religion of the Semites (1927)

inheritance, from a series of ancestors in every state of culture from pure savagery upwards. The record of the religious thought of mankind, as it is embodied in religious institutions, resembles the geological record of the history of the earth's crust; the new and the old are preserved side by side, or rather layer upon layer”.

The same thing has happened in India. Speaking about the growth of Religion in India, says Prof. Max Muller :—

“We have seen a religion growing up from stage to stage, from the simplest childish prayers to the highest metaphysical abstractions. In the majority of the hymns of the Veda we might recognise the childhood; in the Brahmanas and their sacrificial, domestic and moral ordinances the busy manhood; in the Upanishads the old age of the Vedic religion. We could have well understood if, with the historical progress of the Indian mind, they had discarded the purely childish prayers as soon as they had arrived at the maturity of the Brahmanas; and if, when the vanity of sacrifices and the real character of the old gods had once been recognised, they would have been superseded by the more exalted religion of the Upanishads. But it was not so. Every religious thought that had once found expression in India, that had once been handed down as a sacred heirloom, was preserved, and the thoughts of the three historical periods, the childhood, the manhood, and the old age of the Indian nation, were made to do permanent service in the three stages of the life of every individual. Thus alone can we explain how the same sacred code, the Veda, contains not only the records of different phases of religious thought, but of doctrines which we may call almost diametrically opposed to each other.”

But this difficulty is not so great in the case of Religions which are *positive* religions. The fundamental characteristic of *positive* Religions, is that they have not grown up like primitive religions, under the action of unconscious forces operating silently from age to age, but trace their origin to the teaching of great religious innovators, who spoke as the organs of a divine revelation. Being the result of conscious formulations the philosophy of a religion which is positive is easy to find and easy to state. Hinduism like Judaism, Christianity and Islam is in the main a positive religion. One does not have to search for its scheme of divine governance. It is not like an unwritten constitution. On the Hindu scheme of divine governance is enshrined in a written constitution and any one who cares to know it will find it laid bare in that Sacred Book called the Manu Smriti, a divine Code which lays down the rules which govern the religious, ritualistic and social life of

the Hindus in minute detail and which must be regarded as the Bible of the Hindus and containing the philosophy of Hinduism.

The third dimension in the philosophy of religion is the criterion<sup>1</sup> to be adopted for judging the value of the ideal scheme of divine governance for which a given Religion stands. Religion must be put on its trial. By what criterion shall it be judged? That leads to the definition of the norm. Of the three dimensions this third one is the most difficult one to be ascertained and defined.

Unfortunately the question does not appear to have been tackled although much has been written on the philosophy of Religion and certainly no method has been found for satisfactorily dealing with the problem. One is left to one's own method for determining the issue. As for myself I think it is safe to proceed on the view that to know the philosophy of any movement or any institution one must study the revolutions which the movement or the institution has undergone. Revolution is the mother of philosophy and if it is not the mother of philosophy it is a lamp which illuminates philosophy. Religion is no exception to this rule. To me therefore it seems quite evident that the best method to ascertain the criterion by which to judge the philosophy of Religion is to study the Revolutions which religion has undergone. That is the method which I propose to adopt.

Students of History are familiar with one Religious Revolution. That Revolution was concerned with the sphere of Religion and the extent of its authority. There was a time when Religion had covered the whole field of human knowledge and claimed infallibility for what it taught. It covered astronomy and taught a theory of the universe according to which the earth is at rest in the centre of the universe, while the sun, moon, planets and system of fixed stars revolve round it each in its own sphere. It included biology and geology and propounded the view that the growth of life on the earth had been created all at once and had contained from the time of creation onwards, all the heavenly bodies that it now contains and all kinds of animals of plants. It claimed medicine to be its province and taught that disease was either a divine visitation as punishment for sin or it was the work of demons and that it could be cured by the intervention of saints, either in person or through their holy relics ; or by prayers or

<sup>1</sup> Some students of the Philosophy of Religion seem to regard the study of the first two dimensions as all that the field of Philosophy of religion need include. They do not seem to recognize that a consideration of the third dimension is necessary part of the study of the Philosophy of Religion. As an illustration of this see the Article on Theology by Mr. D. S. Adamas in 'Hastings Encyclopedea of Religion and Ethics' Volume XII page 393. I dissent from this view. The difference is probably due to the fact that I regard Philosophy of Religion as a normative study and as a descriptive study. I do not think that there can be such a thing as a general Philosophy of Religion. I believe each Religion has its particular philosophy. To me there is no Philosophy of Religion. There is a philosophy of a Religion.

pilgrimages; or (when due to demons) by exorcism and by treatment which the demons (and the patient) found disgusting. It also claimed physiology and psychology to be its domain and taught that the body and soul were two distinct substances.

Bit by bit this vast Empire of Religion was destroyed. The Copernican Revolution freed astronomy from the domination of Religion. The Darwanian Revolution freed biology and geology from the trammels of Religion. The authority of theology in medicine is not yet completely destroyed. Its intervention in medical questions still continues. Opinion on such subjects as birth-control, abortion and sterilization of the defective are still influenced by theological dogmas. Psychology has not completely freed itself from its entanglements. None the less Darwinism was such a severe blow that the authority of theology was shattered all over to such an extent that it never afterwards made any serious effort to remain its lost empire.

It is quite natural that this disruption of the Empire of Religion should be treated as a great Revolution. It is the result of the warfare which science waged against theology for 400 years, in which many pitched battles were fought between the two and the excitement caused by them was so great that nobody could fail to be impressed by the revolution that was blazing on.

There is no doubt that this religious revolution has been a great blessing. It has established freedom of thought. It has enabled society "to assume control of itself, making its own the world it once shared with superstition, facing undaunted the things of its former fears, and so carving out for itself, from the realm of mystery in which it lies, a sphere of unhampered action and a field of independent thought". The process of secularisation is not only welcomed by scientists for making civilization—as distinguished from culture—possible, even Religious men and women have come to feel that much of what theology taught was unnecessary and a mere hindrance to the religious life and that this chopping of its wild growth was a welcome process.

But for ascertaining the norm for judging the philosophy of Religion we must turn to another and a different kind of Revolution which Religion has undergone. That Revolution touches the nature and content of ruling conceptions of the relations of God to man, of Society to man and of man to man. How great was this revolution can be seen from the differences which divide savage society from civilised society.

Strange as it may seem no systematic study of this Religious Revolution has so far been made. None the less this Revolution is so great and so immense that it has brought about a complete

transformation in the nature of Religion as it is taken to be by savage society and by civilized society although very few seem to be aware of it.

To begin with the comparison between savage society and civilized society.

In the religion of the savage one is struck by the presence of two things. First is the performance of rites and ceremonies, the practice of magic or tabu and the worship of fetish or totem. The second thing that is noticeable is that the rites, ceremonies, magic, tabu, totem and fetish are conspicuous by their connection with certain occasions. These occasions are chiefly those which represent the crises of human life. The events such as birth, the birth of the first born, attaining manhood, reaching puberty, marriage, sickness, death and war are the usual occasions which are marked out for the performance of rites and ceremonies, the use of magic and the worship of the totem.

Students of the origin and history of Religion have sought to explain the origin and substance of religion by reference to either magic, tabu and totem and the rites and ceremonies connected therewith, and have deemed the occasions with which they are connected as of no account. Consequently we have theories explaining religion as having arisen in magic or as having arisen in *fetishism*. Nothing can be a greater error than this. It is true that savage society practises magic, believes in tabu and worships the totem. But it is wrong to suppose that these constitute the religion or form the source of religion. To take such a view is to elevate what is incidental to the position of the principal. The principal thing in the Religion of the savage are the elemental facts of human existence such as life, death, birth, marriage etc. Magic, tabu, totem are things which are incidental. Magic, tabu, totem, fetish etc., are not the ends. They are only the means. The end is life and the preservation of life. Magic, tabu etc., are resorted to by the savage society not for their own sake but to conserve life and to *exercise* evil influences from doing harm to life. Thus understood the religion of the savage society was concerned with life and the preservation of life and it is these life processes which constitute the substance and source of the religion of the savage society. So great was the concern of the savage society for life and the preservation of life that it made them the basis of its religion. So central were the life processes in the religion of the savage society that everything which affected them became part of its religion. The ceremonies of the savage society were not only concerned with the events of birth, attaining of manhood, puberty, marriage, sickness, death and war they were also concerned with food. Among patrol peoples the flocks and herds are sacred. Among

agricultural peoples seed time and harvest are marked by ceremonials performed with some reference to the growth and the preservation of the crops. Likewise drought, pestilence, and other strange, irregular phenomena of nature occasion the performance of ceremonials. Why should such occasions as harvest and famine be accompanied by religious ceremonies? Why is magic, tabu, totem be of such importance to the savage. The only answer is that they all affect the preservation of life. The process of life and its preservation form the main purpose. Life and preservation of life is the core and centre of the Religion of the savage society. As pointed out by Prof. Crawley the religion of the savage begins and ends with the affirmation and conservation of life.

In life and preservation of life consists the religion of the savage. What is however true of the religion of the savage is true of all religions wherever they are found for the simple reason that constitutes the essence of religion. It is true that in the present day society with its theological refinements this essence of religion has become hidden from view and is even forgotten. But that life and the preservation of life constitute the essence of religion even in the present day society is beyond question. This is well illustrated by Prof. Crowley. When speaking of the religious life of man in the present day society, he says how—

“a man's religion does not enter into his professional or social hours, his scientific or artistic moments; practically its chief claims are settled on one day in the week from which ordinary worldly concerns are excluded. In fact, his life is in two parts; but the moiety with which religion is concerned is the elemental. Serious thinking on ultimate questions of life and death is, roughly speaking, the essence of his Sabbath; add to this the habit of prayer, giving the thanks at meals, and the subconscious feeling that birth and death, continuation and marriage are rightly solemnized by religion, while business and pleasure may possibly be consecrated, but only metaphorically or by an overflow of religious feeling.”

Comparing this description of the religious concerns of the man in the present day society with that of the savage, who can deny that the religion is essentially the same, both in theory and practice whether one speaks of the religion of the savage society or of the civilized society.

It is therefore clear that savage and civilized societies agree in one respect. In both the central interests of religion—namely in the life processes by which individuals are preserved and the race

maintained—are the same. In this there is no real difference between the two. But they differ in two other important respects.

In the first place in the religion of the savage society there is no trace of the idea of God. In the second place in the religion of the savage society there is no bond between morality and Religion. In the savage society there is religion without God. In the savage society there is morality but it is independent of Religion.

How and when the idea of God became fused in Religion it is not possible to say. It may be that the idea of God had its origin in the worship of the Great Man in Society, the Hero—giving rise to theism—with its faith in its living God. It may be that the idea of God came into existence as a result of the purely philosophical speculation upon the problem as to who created life—giving rise to Deism—with its belief in God as Architect of the Universe.<sup>1</sup> In any case the idea of God is not integral to Religion. How it got fused into Religion it is difficult to explain. With regard to the relation between Religion and Morality this much may be safely said. Though the relation between God and Religion is not quite integral, the relation between Religion and morality is. Both religion and morality are connected with the same elemental facts of human existence—namely life, death, birth and marriage. Religion consecrates these life processes while morality furnishes rules for their preservation. Religion in consecrating the elemental facts and processes of life came to consecrate also the rules laid down by Society for their preservation. Looked at from this point it is easily explained why the bond between Religion and Morality took place. It was more intimate and more natural than the bond between Religion and God. But when exactly this fusion between Religion and Morality took place it is not easy to say.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the religion of the Civilized Society differs from that of the Savage Society into two important features. In civilized society God comes in the scheme of Religion. In civilized society morality becomes sanctified by Religion.

This is the first stage in the Religious Revolution I am speaking of. This Religious Revolution must not be supposed to have been ended here with the emergence of these two new features in the development of religion. The two ideas having become part of the constitution of the Religion of the Civilized Society have undergone further changes which have revolutionized their meaning and their moral significance. The second stage of the Religious Revolution marks a very radical change. The contrast is so big that civilized society has become split

<sup>1</sup> That the idea of God has evolved from both these directions is well illustrated by Hinduism. Compare the idea of Indra as God and the idea of Bramha as God.



into two, antique society and modern society, so that instead of speaking of the religion of the civilized society it becomes necessary to speak of the religion of antique society as against the religion of modern society.

The religious revolution which marks off antique society from modern society is far greater than the religious revolution which divides savage society from civilized society. Its dimensions will be obvious from the differences it has brought about in the conceptions regarding the relations between God, Society and Man.

The first point of difference relates to the composition of society.

Every human being, without choice on his own part, but simply in virtue of his birth and upbringing, becomes a member of what we call a *natural* society. He belongs that is to a certain family and a certain nation. This membership lays upon him definite obligations and duties which he is called upon to fulfil as a matter of course and on pain of social penalties and disabilities while at the same time it confers upon him certain social rights and advantages. In this respect the ancient and modern worlds are alike. But in the words of Prof. Smith<sup>1</sup> :—

“There is this important difference, that the tribal or national societies of the ancient world were not strictly natural in the modern sense of the word, for the gods had their part and place in them equally with men. The circle into which a man was born was not simply a group of kinsfolk and fellow citizens, but embraced also certain divine beings, the gods of the family and of the state, which to the ancient mind were as much a part of the particular community with which they stood connected as the human members of the social circle. The relation between the gods of antiquity and their worshippers was expressed in the language of human relationship, and this language was not taken in a figurative sense but with strict literality. If a god was spoken of as father and his worshippers as his offsprings, the meaning was that the worshippers were literally of his stock, that he and they made up one natural family with reciprocal family duties to one another. Or, again, if the god was addressed as king, and worshippers called themselves his servants, they meant that the supreme guidance of the state was actually in his hands, and accordingly the organisation of the state included provision for consulting his will and obtaining his direction in all weighty matters, also provision for approaching him as king with due homage and tribute.

“Thus a man was born into a fixed relation to certain gods as surely as he was born into relation to his fellow men; and his

<sup>1</sup>Smith *Ibid*

religion, that is, the part of conduct which was determined by his relation to the gods, was simply one side of the general scheme of conduct prescribed for him by his position as a member of society. There was no separation between the spheres of religion and of ordinary life. Every social act had a reference to the gods as well as to men, for the social body was not made up of men only, but of gods and men."

Thus in ancient Society men and their Gods formed a social and political as well as a religious whole. Religion was founded on kinship between the God and his worshippers. Modern Society has eliminated God from its composition. It consists of men only.

The second point of difference between antique and modern society relates to the bond between God and Society. In the antique world the various communities

"believed in the existence of many Gods, for they accepted as real the Gods of their enemies as well as their own, but they did not worship the strange Gods from whom they had no favour to expect, and on whom their gifts and offerings would have been thrown away.... Each group had its own God, or perhaps a God and Goddess, to whom the other Gods bore no relation whatever."<sup>1</sup>

The God of the antique society was an exclusive God. God was owned by and bound to one singly community. This is largely to be accounted for by

"the share taken by the Gods in the feuds and wars of their worshippers. The enemies of the God and the enemies of his people are identical; even in the Old Testament 'the enemies of Jehovah' are originally nothing else than the enemies of Israel. In battle each God fights for his own people, and to his aid success is ascribed; Chemosh gives victory to Moab, and Asshyr to Assyria; and often the divine image or symbol accompanies the host to battle. When the ark was brought into the camp of Israel, the Philistines said, "Gods are come into the camp; who can deliver us from their own practice, for when David defeated them at Baalperazim, part of the booty consisted in their idols which had been carried into the field. When the Carthaginians, in their treaty with Phillip of Macedon, speak of "the Gods that take part in the campaign," they doubtless refer to the inmates of the sacred tent which was pitched in time of war beside the tent of the general, and before which prisoners were sacrificed after a victory. Similarly an Arabic poet says, "Yaguth went forth with us against Morad"; that is, the image of the God Yaguth was carried into the fray".

<sup>1</sup> Smith *Ibid*

This fact had produced a solidarity between God and the community.

“Hence, on the principle of solidarity between Gods and their worshippers, the particularism characteristic of political society could not but reappear in the sphere of religion. In the same measure as the God of a clan or town had indisputable claim to the reverence and service of the community to which he belonged, he was necessarily an enemy to their enemies and a stranger to those to whom they were strangers”.<sup>1</sup>

God had become attached to a community, and the community had become attached to their God. God had become the God of the Community and the Community had become the chosen community of the God.

This view had two consequences. Antique Society never came to conceive that God could be universal God, the God of all. Antique Society never could conceive that there was any such thing as humanity in general.

The third point of difference between ancient and modern society, has reference to the conception of the fatherhood of God. In the antique Society God was the Father of his people but the basis of this conception of Fatherhood was deemed to be physical.

“In heathen religions the Fatherhood of the Gods is physical fatherhood. Among the Greeks, for example, the idea that the Gods fashioned men out of clay, as potters fashion images, is relatively modern. The older conception is that the races of men have Gods for their ancestors, or are the children of the earth, the common mother of Gods and men, so that men are really of the stock or kin of the Gods. That the same conception was familiar to the older Semites appears from the Bible. Jeremiah describes idolaters as saying to a stock, Thou art my father; and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth. In the ancient poem, Num. xxi. 29, The Moabites are called the sons and daughters of Chemosh, and at a much more recent date the prophet Malachi calls a heathen woman “the daughter of a strange God”. These phrases are doubtless accommodations to the language which the heathen neighbours of Israel used about themselves. In Syria and Palestine each clan, or even complex of clans forming a small independent people, traced back its origin to a great first father; and they indicate that, just as in Greece this father or progenitor of the race was commonly identified with the God of the race. With this it accords that in the judgment of most modern enquirers several names of deities appear in the old genealogies of nations in the Book of Genesis. Edom,

<sup>1</sup> Smith *Ibid*

for example, the progenitor of the Edomites, was identified by the Hebrews with Esau the brother of Jacob, but to the heathen he was a God, as appears from the theophorous proper name Obodedom, "worshipper of Edom", the extant fragments of Phoenician and Babylonian cosmogonies date from a time when tribal religion and the connection of individual Gods with particular kindreds was forgotten or had fallen into the background. But in a generalised form the notion that men are the offspring of the Gods still held its ground. In the Phoenician cosmogony of Philo Bablius it does so in a confused shape, due to the authors euhemerism, that is, to his theory that deities are nothing more than deified men who had been great benefactors to their species. Again, in the Chaldaean legend preserved by Berosus, the belief that men are of the blood of the Gods is expressed in a form too crude not to be very ancient ; for animals as well as men are said to have been formed out of clay mingled with the blood of a decapitated deity. "<sup>1</sup>

This conception of blood kinship of Gods and men had one important consequence. To the antique world God was a human being and as such was not capable of absolute virtue and absolute goodness. God shared the physical nature of man and was afflicted with the passions infirmities and vices to which man was subject. The God of the antique world had all the wants and appetites of man and he often indulged in the vices in which many revelled. Worshipers had to implore God not to lead them into temptations.

In modern Society the idea of divine fatherhood has become entirely dissociated from the physical basis of natural fatherhood. In its place man is conceived to be created in the image of God ; he is not deemed to be begotten by God. This change in the conception of the fatherhood of God looked at from its moral aspect has made a tremendous difference in the nature of God as a Governor of the Universe. God with his physical basis was not capable of absolute good and absolute virtue. With God wanting in righteousness the universe could not insist on righteousness as an immutable principle. This dissociation of God from physical contact with man has made it possible for God to be conceived of as capable of absolute good and absolute virtue.

The fourth point of difference relates to the part religion plays when a change of nationality takes place.

In the antique world there could be no change of nationality unless it was accompanied by a change of Religion. In the antique world,

<sup>1</sup> Smith *Ibid*

“It was impossible for an individual to change his religion without changing his nationality, and a whole community could hardly change its religion at all without being absorbed into another stock or nation. Religions like political ties were transmitted from father to son; for a man could not choose a new God at will; the Gods of his fathers were the only deities on whom he could count as friendly and ready to accept his homage, unless he forswore his own kindred and was received into a new circle of civil as well as religious life.”

How change of religion was a condition precedent to a Social fusion is well illustrated by the dialogue between Naomi and Ruth in the Old Testament.

“Thy Sister” says Naomi to Ruth, “is gone back unto her people and unto her Gods”; and Ruth replies, “Thy people shall be my people and thy God my God.”

It is quite clear that in the ancient world a change of nationality involved a change of cult. Social fusion meant religious fusion.

In modern society abandonment of religion or acceptance of another is not necessary for social fusion. This is best illustrated by what is in modern terminology and naturalization, whereby the citizen of one state abandons his citizenship of the state and becomes a citizen of a new state. In this process of naturalization religion has no place. One can have a social fusion—which is another name for naturalization—without undergoing a religious fusion.

To distinguish modern society from antique society it is not enough to say that Modern Society consists of men only. It must be added that it consists of men who are worshippers of different Gods.

The fifth point of difference relates to the necessity of knowledge as to the nature of God as part of religion.

“From the antique point of view, indeed the question what the Gods are in themselves is not a religious but a speculative one; what is requisite to religion is a practical acquaintance with the rules on which the deity acts and on which he expects his worshippers to frame their conduct—what in 2 Kings xvii. 26 is called the “manner” or rather the “customary law” (misphat) of the God of the land. This is true even of the religion of Israel. When the prophets speak of the knowledge of the laws and principles of His government in Israel, and a summary expression for religion as a whole is “the knowledge and fear of Jehovah,” i.e. the knowledge of what Jehovah prescribes, combined with a reverent obedience. An extreme scepticism towards all religious speculation is recommended in the Book of Ecclesiastes as the proper attitude of

piety, for no amount of discussion can carry a man beyond the plain rule, to "fear God and keep His Commandments". This counsel the author puts into the mouth of Solomon, and so represents it, not unjustly, as summing up the old view of religion, which in more modern days had unfortunately begun to be undermined."

The sixth point of difference relates to the place of belief in Religion.

In ancient Society:—

"ritual and practical usages were, strictly speaking, the sum total of ancient religions. Religion in primitive times was not a system of belief with practical applications; it was a body of fixed traditional practices, to which every member of society conformed as a matter of courage. Men would not be men if they agreed to do certain things without having a reason for their action; but in ancient religion the reason was not first formulated as a doctrine and then expressed in practice, but conversely, practice preceded doctrinal theory. Men form general rule of conduct before they begin to express general principles in words; political institutions are older than political theories and in like manner religious institutions are older than religious theories. This analogy is not arbitrarily chosen, for in fact the parallelism in ancient society between religious and political institutions is complete. In each sphere great importance was attached to form and precedent, but the explanation why the precedent was followed consisted merely of legend as to its first establishment. That the precedent, once established, was authoritative did not appear to require any proof. The rules of society were based on precedent, and the continued existence of the society was sufficient reason why a precedent once set should continue to be followed."

The seventh point of difference relates to the place of individual conviction in Religion. In ancient Society:—

"Religion was a part of the organised social life into which a man was born, and to which he conformed through life in the same unconscious way in which men fall into any habitual practice of the society in which they live. Men took the Gods and their worship for granted, just as they took the other usages of the state for granted, and if they reason or speculated about them, they did so on the presupposition that the traditional usages were fixed things, behind which their reasonings must not go, and which no reasoning could be allowed to overturn. To us moderns religion is above all a matter of individual conviction and reasoned belief, but to the ancients it was a part of the citizen's public life, reduced to fixed forms, which

he was not bound to understand and was not at liberty to criticise or to neglect. Religious non-conformity was an offence against the state; for if sacred tradition was tampered with the bases of society were undermined, and the favour of the Gods was forfeited. But so long as the prescribed forms were duly observed, a man was recognised as truly pious, and no one asked how his religion was rooted in his heart or affected his reason. Like political duty, of which indeed it was a part, religion was entirely comprehended in the observance of certain fixed rules of outward conduct."

The eighth point of difference pertains to the relation of God to Society and man, of Society to Man in the matter of God's Providence.

First as to the difference in the relation of God to Society. In this connection three points may be noted.

The faith of the antique world

"Sought nothing higher than a condition of physical *bien etre*.... The good things desired of the Gods were the blessings of earthly life, not spiritual but carnal things."

What the antique societies asked and believed themselves to receive from their God lay mainly in the following things:

"Abundent harvests, help against their enemies and counsel by oracles or soothsayers in matters of natural difficulty."

In the antique world

"Religion was not the affair of the individual but of the Community.... It was the community, and not the individual, that was sure of the permanent and the unfailing hand of the deity."

Next as to the difference in the relation of God to man.

"It was not the business of the Gods of heathenism to watch, by a series of special providences, over the welfare of every individual. It is true that individuals laid their private affairs before the Gods, and asked with prayers and views for strictly personal blessings. But they did this just as they might crave a personal boon from a king, or as a son craves a boon from a father, without expecting to get all that was asked. What the Gods might do in this way was done as a matter of personal favour, and was no part of their proper function as heads of the community."

"The Gods watched over a man's civic life, they gave him his share in public benefits, the annual largess of the harvest and the vintage, national peace or victory over enemies, and so forth, but they were not sure helpers in every private need, and above all they would not help him in matters that were against the interests of the community as a whole. There was therefore a whole region of

possible needs and desires for which religion could and would do nothing."

Next the difference in the attitude of God and Society to man.

In the antique world Society was indifferent to individual welfare. God was no doubt bound to Society. But

"The compact between the God and his worshippers was not held to pledge the deity to make the private cares of each member of the Community his own."

"The benefits expected of God were of a public character affecting the whole community, especially fruitful seasons, increase of flocks of herds and success in war. So long as community flourished the fact that an individual was miserable reflected no discredit on divine providence."

On the contrary the antique world looked upon the misery of a man as proof.

"That the sufferer was an evil-doer, justly hateful to the Gods.

Such a man was out of place among the happy and the prosperous crowd that assembled on feast days before the altar."

It is in accordance with this view that the leper and the mourner were shut out from the exercise of religion as well as from the privileges of social life and their food was not brought into the house of God.

As for conflict between individual and individual and between society and the individual God had no concern. In the antique world:

"It was not expected that (God) should always be busy righting human affairs. In ordinary matters it was men's business to help themselves and their own kins folk, though the sense that the God was always near, and could be called upon at need, was a moral force continually working in some degree for the maintenance of social righteousness and order. The strength of this moral force was indeed very uncertain, for it was always possible for the evil-doer to flatter himself that his offence would be overlooked."

In the antique world man did not ask God to be righteous to him.

"Whether in civil or in profane matters, the habit of the old world was to think much of the community and little of the individual life, and no one felt this to be unjust even though it bore hardly on himself. The God was the God of the nation or of the tribe, and he knew and cared for the individual only as a member of the community."

That was the attitude that man in the antique world took of his own private misfortune. Man came to rejoice before his God and

"in rejoicing before his God man rejoiced with and for the welfare of his kindred, his neighbours and his country, and, in renewing by



a solemn act of worship the bond that united him to God, he also renewed the bonds of family, social and national obligation. ”

Man in the antique world did not call upon his maker to be righteous to him.

Such is this other Revolution in Religion.

There have thus been two Religious Revolutions. One was an external Revolution. The other was an internal Revolution. The External Revolution was concerned with the field within which the authority of Religion was to prevail. The Internal Revolution had to do with the changes in Religion as a scheme of divine Governance for human society. The External Revolution was not really a Religious Revolution at all. It was a revolt of science against the extra territorial jurisdiction assumed by Religion over a field which did not belong. The Internal Revolution was a real Revolution or may be compared to any other political Revolution, such as the French Revolution or the Russian Revolution. It involved a constitutional change. By this Revolution the Scheme of divine governance came to be altered, amended and reconstituted.

How profound have been the changes which this internal Revolution, has made in the antique scheme of divine governance can be easily seen. By this Revolution God has ceased to be a member of a community. Thereby he has become impartial. God has ceased to be the Father of Man in the physical sense of the word. He has become the creator of the Universe. The breaking of this blood bond has made it possible to hold that God is good. By this Revolution man has ceased to be a blind worshipper of God doing nothing but obeying his commands. Thereby man has become a responsible person required to justify his belief in God's commandments by his conviction. By this Revolution God has ceased to be merely the protector of Society and social interests in gross have ceased to be the centre of the divine Order. Society and man have changed places as centres of this divine order. It is man who has become the centre of it.

All this analysis of the Revolution in the Ruling concepts of Religion as a scheme of divine governance had one purpose namely to discover the norm for evaluating the philosophy of a Religion. The impatient reader may not ask where are these norms and what are they? The reader may not have found the norms specified by their names in the foregoing discussion. But he could not have failed to notice that the whole of this Religious Revolution was raging around the norms for judging what is right and what is wrong. If he has not, let me make explicit what has been implicit in the whole of this discussion. We began with the distinction between antique society and

modern society as has been pointed out they differed in the type of divine governance they accepted as their Religious ideals. At one end of the Revolution was the antique society with its Religious ideal in which the end was Society. At the other end of the Revolution is the modern Society with its Religious ideal in which the end is the individual. To put the same fact in terms of the norm it can be said that the norm or the criterion, for judging right and wrong in the Antique Society was *utility* while the norm or the criterion for judging right and wrong in the modern Society is *justice*. The Religious Revolution was not thus a revolution in the religious organization of Society resulting in the shifting of the centre—from society to the individual—it was a revolution in the norms.

Some may demur to the norms I have suggested. It may be that it is a new way of reaching them. But to my mind there is no doubt that they are the real norms by which to judge the philosophy of religion. In the first place the norm must enable people to judge what is right and wrong in the conduct of men. In the second place the norm must be appropriate to current notion of what constitutes the moral good. From both these points of view they appear to be the true norms. They enable us to judge what is right and wrong. They are appropriate to the society which adopted them. Utility as a criterion was appropriate to the antique world in which society being the end, the moral good was held to be something which had social utility. Justice as a criterion became appropriate to the Modern World in which individual being the end, the moral good was held to be something which does justice to the individual. There may be controversy as to which of the two norms is morally superior. But I do not think there can be any serious controversy that these are not the norms. If it is said that these norms are not transcendental enough; my reply is that if a norm whereby one is to judge the philosophy of religion must be Godly, it must also be earthly. At any rate these are the norms I propose to adopt in examining the philosophy of Hinduism.

## II

This is a long detour. But it was a necessary preliminary to any inquiry into the main question. However, when one begins the inquiry one meets with an initial difficulty. The Hindu is not prepared to face the inquiry. He either argues that religion is of no importance or he takes shelter behind the view—fostered by the study of comparative Religion—that all religions are good. There is no doubt that both these views are mistaken and untenable.

Religion as a social force cannot be ignored. Religion has been aptly described by Hebert Spencer as “the weft which everywhere crosses the warp of history”. This is true of every Society. But Religion has not only crossed everywhere the warp of Indian History it forms the warp and woof of the Hindu mind. The life of the Hindu is regulated by Religion at every moment of his life. It orders him how during life he should conduct himself and how on death his body shall be disposed of. It tells him how and when he shall indulge in his sexual impulses. It tells him what ceremonies are to be performed when a child is born—how he should name, how he should cut the hair on its head, how he should perform its first feeding. It tells him what occupation he can take to, what woman he should marry. It tells him with whom he should dine and what food he should eat, what vegetables are lawful and what are forbidden. It tells how he should spend his day, how many times he should eat, how many times he should pray. There is no act of the Hindu which is not covered or ordained by Religion. It seems strange that the educated Hindus should come to look upon it as though it was a matter of indifference.

Besides, Religion is a social force. As I have pointed out Religion stands for a scheme of divine governance. The scheme becomes an ideal for society to follow. The ideal may be non-existent in the sense that it is something which is constructed. But although non-existent, it is real. For an ideal it has full operative force which is inherent in every ideal. Those who deny the importance of religion not only forget this, they also fail to realize how great is the potency and sanction that lies behind a religious ideal as compound with that of a purely secular ideal. This is probably due to the lag which one sees between the real and the ideal which is always present whether the ideal is religious or secular. But the relative potency of the two ideals is to be measured by another test—namely their power to override the practical instincts of man. The ideal is concerned with something that is remote. The practical instincts of man are concerned with the immediate present. Now placed as against the force of the practical instincts of man the two ideals show their difference in an unmistakable manner. The practical instincts of man do yield to the prescriptions of a religious ideal however much the two are opposed to each other. The practical instincts of man do not on the other hand yield to the secular ideal if the two are in conflict. This means that a religious ideal has a hold on mankind, irrespective of an earthly gain. This can never be said of a purely secular ideal. Its power depends upon its power to confer material benefit. This shows how great is the difference in the potency and sanction of the two ideals over the human mind. A religious ideal

never fails to work so long as there is faith in that ideal. To ignore religion is to ignore a live wire.

Again to hold that all religions are true and good is to cherish a belief which is positively and demonstrably wrong. This belief, one is sorry to say, is the result of what is known as the study of comparative religion. Comparative religion has done one great service to humanity. It has broken down the claim and arrogance of revealed religions as being the only true and good religions of study. While it is true that comparative religion has abrogated the capricious distinction between true and false religions based on purely arbitrary and a priori considerations, it has brought in its wake some false notions about religion. The most harmful one is the one I have mentioned namely that all religions are equally good and that there is no necessity of discriminating between them. Nothing can be a greater error than this. Religion is an institution or an influence and like all social influences and institutions, it may help or it may harm a society which is in its grip. As pointed out by Prof. Tiele<sup>1</sup> religion is

“one of the mightiest motors in the history of mankind, which formed as well as tore asunder nations, united as well as divided empires, which sanctioned the most atrocious and barbarous deeds, the most libinous customs, inspired the most admirable acts of heroism, self renunciation, and devotion, which occasioned the most sanguinary wars, rebellions and persecutions, as well as brought about the freedom, happiness and peace of nations—at one time a partisan of tyranny, at another breaking its chains, now calling into existence and fostering a new and brilliant civilization, then the deadly foe to progress, science and art.”

A force which shows such a strange contrast in its result can be accepted as good without examining the form it takes and the ideal it serves. Everything depends upon what social ideal a given religion as a divine scheme of governance hold out. This is a question which is not avowed by the science of comparative religion. Indeed it begins where comparative religion ends. The Hindu is merely trying to avoid it by saying that although religions are many they are equally good. For they are not.

However much the Hindu may seek to burke the inquiry into the philosophy of Hinduism there is no escape. He must face it.

### III

Now to begin with the subject. I propose to apply both the tests, the test of justice and the test of utility to judge the philosophy of

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Crowby. *Tree of Life*, page 5.

Hinduism. First I will apply the test of justice. Before doing so I want to explain what I mean by the principle of justice. No one has expounded it better than Professor Bergson<sup>1</sup>. As interpreted by him the principle of justice is a compedious one and includes most of the other principles which have become the foundation of a moral order. Justice has always evoked ideas of equality, of proportion of "compensation". Equity signifies equality. Rules and regulations, right and righteousness are concerned with equality in value. If all men are equal, all men are of the same essence and the common essence entitled them to the same fundamental rights and to equal liberty.

In short justice is simply another name for liberty equality and fraternity. It is in this sense I shall be using<sup>2</sup> justice as a criterion to judge Hinduism.

Which of these tenets does Hinduism recognize? Let us take the question one by one.

#### I. Does Hinduism recognise Equality?

The question instantaneously brings to one's mind the caste system. One striking feature of the caste system is that the different castes do not stand as an horizontal series all on the same plane. It is a system in which the different castes are placed in a vertical series one above the other. Manu may not be responsible for the creation of caste. Manu preached the sanctity of the Varna and as I have shown Varna is the parent of caste. In that sense Manu can be charged with being the progenitor if not the author of the Caste System. Whatever be the case as to the guilt of Manu regarding the Caste System there can be no question that Manu is responsible for upholding the principle of gradation and rank.

In the scheme of Manu the Brahmin is placed at the first in rank. *Below* him is the Kshatriya. *Below* Kshatriya is the Vaishya. *Below* Vaishya is the Shudra and *Below* Shudra is the Ati-Shudra (the Untouchables). This system of rank and gradation is, simply another way of enunciating the principle of inequality so that it may be truly said that Hinduism does not recognise equality. This inequality in status is not merely the inequality that one sees in the warrant of precedence prescribed for a ceremonial gathering at a King's Court. It is a permanent social relationship among the classes to be observed—to be enforced—at all times in all places and for all purposes. It will take too long to show how in every phase of life Manu has introduced and made inequality the vital force of life. But I will

<sup>1</sup>Two Moralities page.

<sup>2</sup> For another interpretation of justice see J. S. Mill—Utilitarianism.

illustrate it by taking a few examples such as slavery, marriage and Rule of Law.

Manu recognizes<sup>1</sup> Slavery. But he confined it to the Shudras. Only Shudras could be made slaves of the three higher classes. But the higher classes could not be the slaves of the Shudra.

But evidently practice differed from the law of Manu and not only Shudras happened to become slaves but members of the other three classes also become slaves. When this was discovered to be the case a new rule was enacted by a Successor of Manu namely Narada<sup>2</sup>. This new rule of Narada runs as follows:—

V 39. In the inverse order of the four castes slavery is not ordained except where a man violates the duties peculiar to his caste. Slavery (in that respect) is analogous to the condition of a wife.”

Recognition of slavery was bad enough. But if the rule of slavery had been left free to take its own course it would have had at least one beneficial effect. It would have been a levelling force. The foundation of caste would have been destroyed. For under it a Brahmin might have become the slave of the Untouchable and the Untouchable would have become the master of the Brahmin. But it was seen that unfettered slavery was an equalitarian principle and an attempt was made to nullify it. Manu and his successors therefore while recognizing slavery ordain that it shall not be recognized in its inverse order to the Varna System. That means that a Brahmin may become the slave of another Brahmin. But he shall not be the slave of a person of another Varna i.e. of the Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra, or Ati-Shudra. On the other hand a Brahmin may hold as his slave any one belonging to the four Varnas. A Kshatriya can have a Kshatriya, Vaisha, Shudra and Ati-Shudra as his slaves but not one who is a Brahmin. A Vaishya can have a Vaishya, Shudra and Ati-Shudra as his slaves but not one who is a Brahmin or a Kshatriya. A Shudra can hold a Shudra and Ati-shudra can hold an Ati-Shudra as his slave but not one who is a Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya or Shudra.

Consider Manu on marriage. Here are his rules governing intermarriage among the different classes.

Manu says:—

III. 12. “For the first marriage of the twice born classes, a woman of the same class is recommended but for such as are impelled by inclination to marry again, women in the direct order of the classes are to be preferred.”

<sup>1</sup> Manu recognizes seven kinds of slaves (VIII-415). Narada recognizes fifteen kinds of slaves (V-25)

<sup>2</sup> The same rule is laid down by Yajnavalkya (II-183) whose authority is equal to that of Manu.

III. 13. "A Shudra woman only must be the wife of Shudra : she and a Vaisya, of a Vaisya ; they two and a Kshatriya, of a Kshatriya ; those two and a Brahmani of a Brahman."

Manu is of course opposed to intermarriage. His injunction is for each class to marry within his class. But he does recognize marriage outside the defined class. Here again he is particularly careful not to allow intermarriage to do harm to his principle of inequality among classes. Like Slavery he permits intermarriage but not in the inverse order. A Brahmin when marrying outside his class may marry any woman from any of the classes below him. A Kshatriya is free to marry a woman from the two classes next below him namely the Vaishya and Shudra but must not marry a woman from the Brahmin class which is above him. A Vaishya is free to marry a woman from the Shudra Class which is next below him. But he cannot marry a woman from the Brahmin and the Kshatriya Class which are above him.

Why this discrimination ? The only answer is that Manu was most anxious to preserve the rule of inequality which was his guiding principle.

Take Rule of Law. Rule of Law is generally understood to mean equality before law. Let any one interested to know what Manu has to say on the point ponder over the following Rules extracted from his code which for easy understanding I have arranged under distinct headings.

*As to witnesses.*—According to Manu they are to be sworn as follows:—

VIII. 87. "In the forenoon let the judge, being purified, severally call on the twice-born, being purified also, to declare the truth, in the presence of some image, a symbol of the divinity and of Brahmens, while the witnesses turn their faces either to the north or to the east."

VIII. 88. "To a Brahman he must begin with saying, 'Declare'; to a Kshatriya, with saying, 'Declare the truth'; to a Vaisya, with comparing perjury to the crime of stealing kine, grain or gold; to a Sudra, with comparing it in some or all of the following sentences, to every crime that men can commit."

VIII. 113. "Let the judge cause a priest to swear by his veracity; a soldier, by his horse, or elephant, and his weapons; a merchant, by his kine, grain, and gold; a mechanic or servile man, by imprecating on his own head, if he speak falsely, all possible crimes ;"

Manu also deals with cases of witnesses giving false evidence. According to Manu giving false evidence is a crime, says Manu:—

VIII. 122. “Learned men have specified these punishments, which were ordained by sage legislators for perjured witnesses, with a view to prevent a failure of justice and to restrain iniquity.”

VIII. 123. “Let a just prince banish men of the three lower classes, if they give false evidence, having first levied the fine; but a Brahman let him only banish.”

But Manu made one exception:—

VIII. 112. “To women, however, at a time of dalliance, or on a proposal of marriage, in the case of grass or fruit eaten by a cow, of wood taken for a sacrifice, or of a promise made for the preservation of a Brahman, it is deadly sin to take a light oath.” As parties to proceedings—Their position can be illustrated by quoting the ordinances of Manu relating to a few of the important criminal offences dealt with by Manu.

Take the offence of Defamation. Manu says:—

VIII. 267. “A soldier, defaming a priest, shall be fined a hundred panas, a merchant, thus offending, an hundred and fifty, or two hundred; but, for such an offence, a mechanic or servile man shall be shipped.”

III. 268. “A priest shall be fined fifty, if he slander a soldier; twenty five, if a merchant; and twelve, if he slander a man of the servile class.”

Take the offence of Insult—Manu says:—

VIII. 270. “A once born man, who insults the twice-born with gross invectives, ought to have his tongue slit; for he sprang from the lowest part of Brahma.”

VIII. 271. “If he mention their names and classes with contumely, as if he say, “Oh Devadatta, though refuse of Brahmin”, an iron style, ten fingers long, shall be thrust red into his mouth.”

VIII. 272. “Should he, through pride, give instruction to priests concerning their duty, let the king order some hot oil to be dropped into his mouth and his ear.”

Take the offence of Abuse—Manu says:—

VIII. 276. “For mutual abuse by a priest and a soldier, this fine must be imposed by a learned king; the lowest amercement on the priest, and the middle-most on the soldier.”

VIII. 277. “Such exactly, as before mentioned, must be the punishment a merchant and a mechanic, in respect of their several



classes, **except** the slitting of the tongue; this is a fixed rule of punishment."

Take the offence of Assault—Manu propounds:—

VIII. 279. "With whatever member a low-born man shall assault **or** hurt a superior, even that member of his must be slit, or cut more **or** less in proportion to the injury; this is an ordinance of Manu."

VIII. 280. "He who raises his hand or a staff against another, shall have his hand cut; and he, who kicks another in wrath, shall have an **incision** made in his foot."

Take the offence of Arrogance—According to Manu:—

VIII. 281. "A man of the lowest class, who shall insolently place himself on the same seat with one of the highest, shall either be banished with a mark on his hinder parts, or the king, shall cause a gash **to** be made on his buttock."

VIII. 282. "Should he spit on him through price, the king shall order **both** his lips to be gashed; should he urine on him, his penis: should **he** break wing against him, his anus."

VIII. 283. "If he seize the Brahman by the locks, or by the feet, or by the **beard**, or by the throat, or by the scrotum, let the king without **hesitation** cause incisions to be made in his hands."

Take the offence of Adultery. Says Manu:—

VIII. 359. "A man of the servile class, who commits actual adultery **with** the wife of a priest, ought to suffer death; the wives, indeed, of **all** the four classes must ever be most especially guarded."

VIII. 366. "A low man, who makes love to a damsel of high birth, ought to be punished corporally; but he who addresses a maid of equal **rank**, shall give the nuptial present and marry her, if her father please."

VIII. 374. "A mechanic or servile man, having an adulterous connection with a woman of a twice-born class, whether guarded at home or **unguarded**, shall thus be punished; if she was unguarded, he shall **lose** the part offending, and his whole substance; if guarded, and a priestless, every thing, even his life."

VIII. 375. "For adultery with a guarded priestess, a merchant shall **forfeit** all his wealth after imprisonment for a year; a soldier shall be **fin**ed a thousand panas, and he be shaved with the urine of an ass."

VIII. 376. "But, if a merchant or soldier commit adultery with a woman of the sacerdotal class, whom her husband guards not at home, the king shall only fine the merchant five hundred, and the soldier a **thousand**;"

VIII. 377. "Both of them, however, if they commit that offence with a priestess not only guarded but eminent for good qualities, shall be punished like men of the servile class, or be burned in a fire of dry grass or reeds."

VIII. 382. "If a merchant converse criminally with a guarded woman of the military, or a soldier with one of the mercantile class, they both deserve the same punishment as in the case of a priestess unguarded."

VIII. 383. "But a Brahman, who shall commit adultery with a guarded woman of those two classes, must be fined a thousand panas; and for the life offence with a guarded woman of the servile class, the fine of a soldier or a merchant shall be also one thousand."

VIII. 384. "For adultery with a woman of the military class, if guarded, the fine of a merchant is five hundred; but a soldier, for the converse of that offence, must be shaved with urine, or pay the fine just mentioned."

VIII. 385. "A priest shall pay five hundred panas if he connect himself criminally with an unguarded woman of the military, commercial, or servile class, and a thousand, for such a connexion with a woman of a vile mixed breed."

Turning to the system of punishment for offences Manu's Scheme throws an interesting light on the subject. Consider the following ordinances:—

VIII. 379. "Ignominious tonsure is ordained, instead of capital punishment, for an adulterer of the priestly class, where the punishment of other classes may extend to loss of life."

VIII. 380. "Never shall the king slay a Brahman, though convicted of all possible crimes; let him banish the offender from his realm, but with all his property secure, and his body unhurt."

XI. 127. "For killing intentionally a virtuous man of the military class, the penance must be a fourth part of that ordained for killing a priest; for killing a Vaisya, only an eighth, for killing a Sudra, who had been constant in discharging his duties, a sixteenth part."

XI. 128. "But, if a Brahmen kill a Kshatriya without malice, he must, after a full performance of his religious rites, give the priests one bull together with a thousand cows."

XI. 129. "Or he may perform for three years the penance for slaying a Brahmen, mortifying his organs of sensation and action, letting his hair grow long, and living remote from the town, with the root of a tree for his mansion."

XI. 130. "If he kill without malice a Vaisya, who had a good moral character, he may perform the same penance for one year, or give the priests a hundred cows and a bull."

XI. 131. "For six months must he perform this whole penance, if without intention he kill a Sudra; or he may give ten white cows and a bull to the priests."

VIII. 381. "No greater crime is known on earth than slaying a Brahman; and the king, therefore, must not even form in his mind an idea of killing a priest."

VIII. 126. "Let the king having considered and ascertained the frequency of a similar offence, the place and time, the ability of the criminal to pay or suffer and the crime itself, cause punishment to fall on those alone, who deserves it."

VIII. 124. "Manu, son of the Self-existent, has named ten places of punishment, which are appropriated to the three lower classes, but a Brahman must depart from the realm unhurt in any one of them."

VIII. 125. "The part of generation, the belly, the tongue, the two hands, and, fifthly, the two feet, the eye, the nose, both ears, the property, and, in a capital case, the whole body."

How strange is the contrast between Hindu and Non-Hindu criminal jurisprudence? How inequality is writ large in Hinduism as seen in its criminal jurisprudence? In a penal code charged with the spirit of justice we find two things—a section dealing defining the crime and a section prescribing a rational form of punishment for breach of it and a rule that all offenders are liable to the same penalty. In Manu what do we find? First an irrational system of punishment. The punishment for a crime is inflicted on the organ concerned in the crime such as belly, tongue, nose, eyes, ears, organs of generation etc., as if the offending organ was a sentient being having a will for its own and had not been merely a servitor of human being. Second feature of Manu's penal code is the inhuman character of the punishment which has no proportion to the gravity of the offence. But the most striking feature of Manu's Penal Code which stands out in all its nakedness is the inequality of punishment for the same offence. Inequality designed not merely to punish the offender but to protect also the dignity and to maintain the baseness of the parties coming to a Court of Law to seek justice in other words to maintain the social inequality on which his whole scheme is founded.

So far I have taken for illustrations such matters as serve to show how Manu has ordained social inequality. I now propose to take other matters dealt with by Manu in order to illustrate that Manu has also

ordained Religious inequality. These are matters which are connected with what are called sacraments and Ashrams.

The Hindus like the Christians believe in sacraments. The only difference is that the Hindus have so many of them that even the Roman Catholic Christians would be surprised at the extravagant number observed by the Hindus. Originally their number was forty and covered the most trivial as well as the most important occasions in a person's life. First they were reduced to twenty. Later on it was reduced to sixteen<sup>1</sup> and at that figure the sacraments of the Hindus have remained stabilized.

Before I explain how at the core of these rules of sacraments there lies the spirit of inequality the reader must know what the rules are. It is impossible to examine all. It will be enough if I deal with a few of them. I will take only three categories of them, those relating with Initiation, Gayatri and Daily Sacrifices.

First as to Initiation. This initiation is effected by the investiture of a person with the sacred thread. The following are the most important rules of Manu regarding the sacrament of investiture.

II. 36. "In the eighth year from the conception of a Brahman, in the eleventh from that of a Kshatriya, and in the twelfth from that of a Vaisya, let the father invest the child with the mark of his class."

II. 37. "Should a Brahman, or his father for him, be desirous of his advancement in sacred knowledge; a Kshatriya, of extending his power; or a Vaisya of engaging in mercantile business; the investiture may be made in the fifth, sixth, or eighth years respectively."

II. 38. "The ceremony of investiture hallowed by the Gayatri must not be delayed, in the case of a priest, beyond the sixteenth year; nor in that of a soldier, beyond the twenty second; nor in that of a merchant, beyond the twenty fourth."

II. 39. "After that, all youths of these three classes, who have not been invested at the proper time, become vratyas, or outcasts, degraded from the Gayatri, and condemned by the virtuous."

II. 147. "Let a man consider that as a mere human birth, which his parents gave him for their mutual gratification, and which he receives after lying in the womb."

II. 148. "But that birth which his principal acharya, who knows the whole Veda, procures for him by his divine mother the Gayatri, is a true birth; that birth is exempt from age and from death."

<sup>1</sup>The following are the sixteen sacraments:—

II. 169. "The first birth is from a natural mother; the second, from the ligation of the zone; the third from the due performance of the sacrifice; such are the births of him who is usually called twice-born, according to a text of the Veda."

II. 170. "Among them his divine birth is that, which is distinguished by the ligation of the zone, and sacrificial cord; and in that birth the Gayatri is his mother, and the Acharya, his father." Then let me come to Gayatri. It is a Mantra or an invocation of special spiritual efficacy. Manu explains what it is.

II. 76. "Brahma milked out, as it were, from the three Vedas, the letter A, the letter U, and the letter M which form by their coalition the triliteral monosyllable, together with three mysterious words, *bhur*, *bhuvah*, *swar*, or earth, sky, heaven."

II. 77. "From the three Vedas, also the Lord of creatures, incomprehensibly exalted, successively milked out the three measures of that ineffable text, beginning with the word *tad*, and entitled *Savitri* or *Gayatri*."

II. 78. "A priest who shall know the Veda, and shall pronounce to himself, both morning and evening, that syllable and that holy text preceded by the three words, shall attain the sanctity which the Veda confers."

II. 79. "And a twice born man, who shall a thousand times repeat those three (or *om*, the *vyahritis*, and the *gayatri*,) apart from the multitude, shall be released in a month even from a great offence, as a snake from his slough."

II. 80. "The priest, the soldier, and the merchant, who shall neglect this mysterious text, and fail to perform in due season his peculiar acts of piety, shall meet with contempt among the virtuous."

II. 81. "The great immutable words, preceded by the triliteral syllable, and followed by the *Gayatri* which consists of three measures, must be considered as the mouth, or principal part of the Veda."

II. 82. "Whoever shall repeat, day by day, for three years, without negligence, that sacred text, shall hereafter approach the divine essence, move as freely as air, and assume an ethereal form."

II. 83. "The triliteral monosyllable is an emblem of the Supreme, the suppressions of breath with a mind fixed on God are the highest devotion; but nothing is more exalted than the *gayatri*; a declaration of truth is more excellent than silence."

II. 84. "All rights ordained in the Veda, oblations to fire, and solemn sacrifices pass away; but that which passes not away, is

declared to be the syllable om, thence called acshare; since it is a symbol of God, the Lord of created beings.”

II. 85. “The act of repeating his Holy Name is ten times better than the appointed sacrifice; an hundred times better when it is heard by no man; and a thousand times better when it is purely mental.”

II. 86. “The four domestic sacraments which are accompanied with the appointed sacrifice, are not equal, though all be united, to a sixteenth part of the sacrifice performed by a repetition of the gayatri.”

Now to the Daily Sacrifices.

III. 69. “For the sake of expiating offences committed ignorantly in those places mentioned in order, the five great sacrifices were appointed by eminent sages to be performed each day by such as keep house.”

III. 70. “Teaching (and studying) the scripture is the sacrifice to the Veda; offering cakes and water, the sacrifice to the Manes, an oblation to fire, the sacrifice to the Deities; giving rice or other food to living creatures, the sacraments of spirits; receiving guests with honour, the sacrifice to men.”

III. 71. “Whoever omits not those five great sacrifices, if he has ability to perform them, is untainted by the sons of the five slaughtering places, even though he constantly resides at home.”

Turning to the Ashramas. The Ashram theory is a peculiar feature of the philosophy of Hinduism. It is not known to have found a place in the teachings of any other religion. According to the Ashram theory life is to be divided into four stages called *Brahmachari*, *Grahashta*, *Vanaprastha* and *Sannyas*. In the Brahmachari stage a person is unmarried and devotes his time to the study and education. After this stage is over he enters the stage of a Grahashta i.e. he marries, rears a family and attends to his worldly welfare. Thereafter he enters the third stage and is then known as a Vanaprastha. As a Vanaprastha he dwells in the forest as a hermit but without severing his ties with his family or without abandoning his rights to his worldly goods. Then comes the fourth and the last stage—that of Sannyas—which means complete renunciation of the world in search of God. The two stages of Brahmachari and Grahashta are natural enough. The two last stages are only recommendatory. There is no compulsion about them. All that Manu lays down is as follows:

VI. 1. A twice born who has thus lived according to the law in the order of householders, may, taking a firm resolution and

keeping his organs in subjection, dwell in the forest, duly (observing the rules given below.)

VI. 2. When a householder sees his (skin) wrinkled, and (his hair) white, and the sons of his son, then he may resort to the forest.

VI. 3. Abandoning all food raised by cultivation, all his belongings, he may depart into the forest, either committing his wife to his sons, or accompanied by her.

VI. 33. But having passed the third part of (a man's natural term of) life in the forest, he may live as an ascetic during the fourth part of his existence, after abandoning all attachment to worldly objects.

The inequality embodied in these rules is real although it may not be quite obvious. Observe that all these sacraments and Ashramas are confined to the twice-born. The Shudras are excluded<sup>1</sup> from their benefit. Manu of course has no objection to their undergoing the forms of the ceremonies. But he objects to their use of the Sacred Mantras in the performance of the ceremonies. On this Manu says:—

X. 127. "Even Shudras, who were anxious to perform their entire duty, and knowing what they should perform, imitate the practice of good men in the household sacraments, but without any holy text, except those containing praise and salvation, are so far from sinning, that they acquire just applause."

See the following text of Manu for women:—

II. 66. "The same ceremonies, except that of the sacrificial thread, must be duly performed for women at the same age and in the same order, that the body may be made perfect; but without any text from the Veda."

Why does Manu prohibit the Shudras from the benefit of the Sacraments? His interdict against the Shudras becoming a Sannyasi is a puzzle. Sannyas means and involves renunciation, abandonment of worldly object. In legal language Sannyas is interpreted as being equivalent to civil death. So that when a man becomes a Sannyasi he is treated as being dead from that moment and his heir succeeds immediately. This would be the only consequence which would follow if a Shudra become a Sannyasi. Such a consequence could hurt nobody except the Shudra himself. Why then this interdict? The issue is important and I will quote Manu to explain the significance and importance of the Sacraments and Sannyas. Let us all ponder over the following relevant texts of Manu:

II. 26. With holy rites, prescribed by the Veda, must the ceremony on conception and other sacraments be performed for

<sup>1</sup> So also are the women.

twice-born men, which sanctify the body and purify (from sin) in this (life) and after death.

II. 28. By the study of the Veda, by vows, by burnt oblations, by (the recitation of) sacred texts, by the (acquisition of the) three sacred Vedas, by offering (to the gods Rishis and Manes), by (the procreation of) sons, by the Great Sacrifices, and by (Srauta) rites this (human) body is made fit for (union with) Bramha. This is the aim and object of the Samskaras. Manu also explains the aim and object of Sannyas.

VI. 81. He (the Sannyasi) who has in this manner gradually given up all attachments and is freed from all the pairs (of opposites), reposes in Brahman alone.

VI. 85. A twice born man who becomes an ascetic, after the successive performance of the above mentioned acts, shakes off sin here below and reaches the highest Brahman.

From these texts it is clear that according to Manu himself the object of the sacraments is to sanctify the body and purify it from sin in this life and hereafter and to make it fit for union with God. According to Manu the object of Sannyas is to reach and repose in God. Yet Manu says that the sacraments and Sannyas are the privileges of the higher classes. They are not open to the Shudra. Why? Does not a Shudra need sanctification of his body, purification of his soul? Does not a Shudra need to have an aspiration to reach God? Manu probably would have answered these questions in the affirmative. Why did he then make such rules. The answer is that he was a staunch believer in social inequality and he knew the danger of admitting religious Equality. If I am equal before God why am I not equal on earth? Manu was probably terrified by this question. Rather than admit and allow religious equality to affect social inequality he preferred to deny religious equality.

Thus in Hinduism you will find both social inequality and religious inequality imbedded in its philosophy.

To prevent man from purifying himself from sin!! To prevent man from getting near to God!! To any rational person such rules must appear to be abominable and an indication of a perverse mind. It is a glaring instance of how Hinduism is a denial not only of equality but how it is denial of the sacred character of human personality.

This is not all. For Manu does not stop with the non-recognition of human personality. He advocates a deliberate debasement of human personality. I will take only two instances to illustrate this feature of the philosophy of Hinduism.



those who study the Caste System are naturally led to into the origin of it. Manu being the progenitor of Caste give an explanation of the origin of the various castes. What origin which Manu gives? His explanation is simple. He says having aside the four original castes the rest are simply men!! He says they are the progeny of fornication and adultery between men and women of the four original castes. The immorality and looseness of character among men and women of the four original castes must have been limitless to account for the rise of the vile castes consisting of innumerable souls!! Manu makes a bold allegation without stopping to consider what aspersions he is heaping upon men and women of the four original castes. For if Chandals--the old name for the Untouchables--are the progeny of a Brahman female and a Shudra male then it is obvious that to account for such a large number of Chandals it must be assumed that every Brahman woman was slut and a whore and every Shudra man an adulterous life with complete abandon. Manu in his mad endeavor of debasing the different castes by ascribing to them an ignoble origin seems deliberately to pervert historical facts. I will give only a few illustrations. Take Manu's origin of *Magadha* and *Vaidehik* and compare it with the origin of the same castes as given by Panini the Grammarian. Manu says that *Magadha* is a caste which is born from sexual intercourse between Vaishya male and Kshatriya female. Manu says that *Vaidehik* is a caste which is born from intercourse between a Vaishya male and a Brahmin female. Turn to Panini. Panini says that *Magadha* means a person who is born in the country known as *Magadha*. As to *Vaidehik* Panini says that *Vaidehik* means a person who is resident of the country known as *Videha*. What a contrast!! How cruel it is. Panini lived not later than 300 B.C. Manu lived about 200 A.D. How is it that the people who bore no stigma in the time of Panini became so infamous in the hands of Manu? The answer is that Manu was bent on debasing them. Why Manu was bent on deliberately debasing the castes is a task which is still awaiting exploration.<sup>1</sup> In the meantime note the strange contrast that while Religion everywhere else is bent on the task of raising and ennobling mankind Hinduism is bent on debasing and degrading it.

Another instance I want to use for illustrating the spirit of the system which is inherent in Hinduism pertains to rules regarding the naming of a Hindu child.

<sup>1</sup> Essay "Manu on Caste A puzzle". (This Essay has not been found in the papers of the Editors.)

The names among Hindus fall into four classes. They are either connected with (i) family deity (ii) the month in which the child is born (iii) with the planets under which a child is born or (iv) are purely temporal i.e. connected with business. According to Manu the temporal name of a Hindu should consist of two parts and Manu gives directions as to what the first and the second part should denote. The second part of a Brahmin's name shall be a word implying happiness; of a Kshatriya's a word implying protection; of a Vaishya's a term expressive of prosperity and of a Shudra's an expression denoting service. Accordingly the Brahmins have *Sharma* (happiness) or *Deva* (God), the Kshatriyas have *Raja* (authority) or *Verma* (armour), the Vaishyas have *Gupta* (gifts) or *Datta* (Giver) and the Shudras have *Das* (service) for the second part of their names. As to the first part of their names Manu says that in the case of a Brahmin it should denote something auspicious, in the case of a Kshatriya something connected with power, in the case of a Vaishya something connected with wealth. But in the case of a Shudra Manu says the first part of his name should denote something contemptible!! Those who think that such a philosophy is incredible would like to know the exact reference. For their satisfaction I am reproducing the following texts from Manu. Regarding the naming ceremony Manu says:—

II. 30. Let (the father perform or) cause to be performed the namadheya (the rite of naming the child), on the tenth or twelfth (day after birth), or on a lucky lunar day, in a lucky muhurta, under an auspicious constellation.

II. 31. Let (the first part of) a Brahman's name (denote) something auspicious, a Kshatriya's name be connected with power, and a Vaishya's with wealth, but a Shudra's (express something) contemptible.

II. 32. (The second part of) a Brahman's (name) shall be (a word) implying happiness, of a Kshatriya's (a word) implying protection, of a Vaishya's (a term) expressive of thriving, and of a Shudra's (an expression) denoting service.

Manu will not tolerate the Shudra to have the comfort of a high sounding name. He must be contemptible both in fact and in name.

Enough has been said to show how Hinduism is a denial of equality both social as well as religious and how it is also a degradation of human personality.

Does Hinduism recognize liberty?

Liberty to be real must be accompanied by certain social conditions.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Laski—Liberty in the Modern State.

In the first place there should be social equality. "Privilege tilts the balance of social action in favour of its possessors. The more equal are the social rights of citizens, the more able they are to utilize their freedom.... If liberty is to move to its appointed end it is important that there should be equality."

In the second place there must be economic security. "A man may be free to enter any vocation he may choose.... Yet if he is deprived of security in employment he becomes a prey of mental and physical servitude incompatible with the very essence of liberty.... The perpetual fear of the morrow, its haunting sense of impending disaster, its fitful search for happiness and beauty which perpetually eludes, shows that without economic security, liberty is not worth having. Men may well be free and yet remain unable to realize the purposes of freedom".

In the third place there must be knowledge made available to all. In the complex world man lives at his peril and he must find his way in it without losing his freedom.

"There can, under these conditions, be no freedom that is worthwhile unless the mind is trained to use its freedom. (Given this fact) the right of man to education becomes fundamental to his freedom. Deprive a man of knowledge and you will make him inevitably the slave of those more fortunate than himself.... deprivation of knowledge is a denial of the power to use liberty for great ends. An ignorant man may be free.... (But) he cannot employ his freedom so as to give him assurance of happiness."

Which of these conditions does Hinduism satisfy? How Hinduism is a denial of equality has already been made clear. It upholds privilege and inequality. Thus in Hinduism the very first condition for liberty is conspicuous by its absence.

Regarding economic security three things shine out in Hinduism. In the first place Hinduism denies freedom of a vocation. In the Scheme of Manu each man has his avocation preordained for him before he is born. Hinduism allows no choice. The occupation being preordained it has no relation to capacity nor to inclination.

In the second place Hinduism compels people to serve ends chosen by others. Manu tells the Shudra that he is born to serve the higher classes. He exhorts him to make that his ideal. Observe the following rules laid down by Manu.

X. 121. If a Shudra (unable to subsist by serving Brahmanas) seeks a livelihood, he may serve Kshatriyas, or he may also seek to maintain himself by attending on a wealthy Vaishya.

X. 122. But let a Shudra serve Brahmanas....

Manu does not leave the matter of acting upto the ideal to the Shudra. He goes a step further and provides that the Shudra does not escape or avoid his destined task. For one of the duties enjoined by Manu upon the King is to see that all castes including the Shudra to discharge their appointed tasks.

VIII. 410. "The king should order each man of the mercantile class to practice trade, or money lending, or agriculture and attendance on cattle; and each man of the servile class to act in the service of the twice born."

VIII. 418. "With vigilant care should the king exert himself in compelling merchants and mechanics to perform their respective duties; for, when such men swerve from their duty, they throw this world into confusion."

Failure to maintain was made an offence in the King punishable at Law.

VIII. 335. "Neither a father, nor a preceptor, nor a friend, nor a mother, nor a wife, nor a son, nor a domestic priest must be left unpunished by the King, if they adhere not with firmness to their duty."

VIII. 336. "Where another man of lower birth would be fined one pana, the king shall be fined a thousand, and he shall give the fine to the priests, or cast it into the river, this is a sacred rule."

These rules have a two-fold significance, spiritual as well as economic. In the spiritual sense they constitute the gospel of slavery. This may not be quite apparent to those who know slavery only by its legal outward form and not by reference to its inner meaning. With reference to its inner meaning a slave as defined by Plato means a person who accepts from another the purposes which control his conduct. In this sense a slave is not an end in himself. He is only a means for filling the ends desired by others. Thus understood the Shudra is a slave. In their economic significance the Rules put an interdict on the economic independence of the Shudra. A Shudra, says Manu, must serve. There may not be much in that to complain of. The wrong however consists in that the rules require him to serve others. He is not to serve himself, which means that he must not strive after economic independence. He must forever remain economically dependent on others.

For as Manu says:—

I. 91. One occupation only the lord prescribed to the Shudra to serve meekly even these other three castes.

In the third place Hinduism leaves no scope for the Shudra to accumulate wealth. Manu's rules regarding the wages to be paid to the

Shudra when employed by the three higher classes are very instructive on this point. Dealing with the question of wages to the Shudras, Manu says:—

X. 124. "They must allot to him (Shudra) out of their own family property a suitable maintenance, after considering his ability, his industry, and the number of those whom he is bound to support."

X. 125. "The remnants of their food must be given to him, as well as their old clothes, the refuse of their grain, and their old household furniture.

This is Manu's law of wages. It is not a minimum wage law. It is a maximum wage law. It was also an iron law fixed so low that there was no fear of the Shudra accumulating wealth and obtaining economic security. But Manu did not want to take chances and he went to the length of prohibiting the Shudra from accumulating property. He says imperatively:—

X. 129. No collection of wealth must be made by a Shudra even though he be able to do it; for a Shudra who has acquired wealth gives pain to Brahmans.

Thus in Hinduism, there is no choice of avocation. There is no economic independence and there is no economic security. Economically, speaking of a Shudra is a precarious thing.

In the matter of the spread of knowledge two conditions are prerequisites. There must be formal education. There must be literacy. Without these two, knowledge cannot spread. Without formal education it is not possible to transmit all the resources and achievements of a complex society. Without formal education the accumulated thought and experience relating to a subject cannot be made accessible to the young and which they will never get if they were left to pick up their training in informal association with others. Without formal education he will not get new perceptions. His horizon will not be widened and he will remain an ignorant slave of his routine work. But formal education involves the establishment of special agencies such as schools, books, planned materials such as studies etc. How can any one take advantage of these special agencies of formal education unless he is literate and able to read and write? The spread of the arts of reading and writing i.e. literacy and formal education go hand in hand. Without the existence of two there can be no spread of knowledge.

How does Hinduism stand in this matter?

The conception of formal education in Hinduism is of a very limited character. Formal education was confined only to the study of the

Vedas. That was only natural. For the Hindus believed that there was no knowledge outside the Vedas. That being so formal education was confined to the study of the Vedas. Another consequence was that the Hindu recognized that its only duty was to study in the schools established for the study of the Vedas. These schools benefitted only the Brahmins. The State did not hold itself responsible for opening establishments for the study of arts and sciences which concerned the life of the merchant and the artisan. Neglected by the state they had to shift for themselves.

Each class managed to transmit to its members the ways of doing things it was traditionally engaged in doing. The duties of the Vaishya class required that a young Vaishya should know the rudiments of commercial geography, arithmetic, some languages as well as the practical details of trade. This he learned from his father in the course of the business. The Artisan's class or the Craftsman who sprang out of the Shudra class also taught the arts and crafts to their children in the same way. Education was domestic. Education was practical. It only increased the skill to do a *particular* thing. It did not lead to new perceptions. It did not widen horizon, with the result that the practical education taught him only an isolated and uniform way of acting so that in a changing environment the skill turned out to be gross ineptitude. Illiteracy became an inherent part of Hinduism by a process which is indirect but integral to Hinduism. To understand this process it is necessary to draw attention to rules framed by Manu in regard to the right to teach and study the Vedas. They are dealt with in the following Rules.

I. 88. To the Brahmanas he (the creator) assigned *teaching* and *studying* the Veda.

I. 89. The Kshatriya he (the creator) commanded to *study* the Veda.

I. 90. The Vaishya he (the creator) commanded..... to study the Veda.

II. 116. He who shall acquire knowledge of the Veda without the assent of his preceptor, incurs the guilt of stealing the scripture, and shall sink to the region of torment."

IV. 99. He (the twice born) must never read (the Veda)..... in the presence of the Shudras.

IX. 18. Women have no business with the text of the Veda.

XI. 199. A twice born man who has..... (improperly) divulged the Veda (i.e. to Shudras and women) (commits sin), atones for his offence, if he subsists a year on barley.

In these texts there are embodied three distinct propositions. The Brahmin, Kshatriya and Vaishya can study the Vedas. Of these the

Brahmins alone have the right to teach the Vedas. But in the case of the Shudra he has not only not to study the Vedas but he should not be allowed to hear it read.

The successors of Manu made the disability of the Shudra in the matter of the study of the Veda into an offence involving dire penalties.

For instance Gautama says:—

XII. 4. If the Shudra intentionally listens for committing to memory the Veda, then his ears should be filled with (molten) lead and lac; if he utters the Veda, then his tongue should be cut off; if he has mastered the Veda his body should be cut to pieces.

To the same effect is Katyayana.

The ancient world may be said to have been guilty for failing to take the responsibility for the education of the masses. But never has any society been guilty of closing to the generality of its people the study of the books of its religion. Never has society been guilty of prohibiting the mass of its people from acquiring knowledge. Never has society made any attempt to declare that any attempt made by the common man to acquire knowledge shall be punishable as a crime. Manu is the only divine law giver who has denied the common man the right to knowledge.

But I cannot wait to dilate upon this. I am more immediately concerned in showing how the prohibition against the study of the Vedas to the mass of the people came to give rise to illiteracy and ignorance in secular life. The answer is easy. It must be realized that reading and writing have an integral connection with the teaching and study of the Vedas. Reading and writing were arts necessary for those who were free and privileged to study the Vedas. They were not necessary to those who were not free to do so. In this way reading and writing became incidental to the study of the Vedas. The result was that the theory of Manu regarding the rights and prohibitions in the matter of the teaching and the study of Vedas came to be extended to the arts of reading and writing. Those who had the right to study the Vedas were accorded the right to read and write. Those who had no right to study the Vedas were deprived of the right to read and write. So that it can be rightly said according to the law of Manu reading and writing has become the right of the high class few and illiteracy has become the destiny of the low class many.

Only a step in the process of this analysis will show how Manu by prohibiting literacy was responsible for the general ignorance in which the masses came to be enveloped.

Thus Hinduism far from encouraging spread of knowledge is a gospel of darkness.

Taking these facts into consideration Hinduism is opposed to the conditions in which liberty can thrive. It is therefore denial of liberty.

### III

Does Hinduism recognize Fraternity?

There are two forces prevalent in Society. Individualism and Fraternity. Individualism is ever present. Every individual is ever asking "I and my neighbours, are we all brothers, are we even fiftieth cousins, am I their keeper, why should I do right to them" and under the pressure of his own particular interests acting as though he was an end to himself, thereby developing a non-social and even an anti-social self. Fraternity is a force of opposite character. Fraternity is another name for fellow feeling. It consists in a sentiment which leads an individual to identify himself with the good of others whereby "the good of others becomes to him a thing naturally and necessarily to be attended to like any of the physical conditions of our existence". It is because of this sentiment of fraternity that the individual does not "bring himself to think of the rest of his fellow-creatures as struggling rivals with him for the means of happiness, whom he must desire to see defeated in their object in order that he may succeed in his own." Individualism would produce anarchy. It is only fraternity which prevents it and helps to sustain the moral order among men. Of this there can be no doubt.

How does this sentiment of Fraternity of fellow feeling arise? J. S. Mill says that this sentiment is a natural sentiment.

"The social state is at once so natural, so necessary, and so habitual to man, that, except in some unusual circumstances or by an effort of voluntary abstraction he never conceives himself otherwise than as a member of a body; and this association is riveted more and more, as mankind are further removed from the state of savage independence. Any condition, therefore, which is essential to a state of society, becomes more and more an inseparable part of every person's conception of the state of things which he is born into, and which is the destiny of a human being. Now, society between human beings, except in the relation of master and slave, is manifestly impossible on any other footing than that the interests of all are to be consulted. Society between equals can only exist on the understanding that the interests of all are to be regarded equally. And since in all states of civilisation, every person, except



an absolute monarch, has equals, every one is obliged to live on these terms with some body; and in every age some advance is made towards a state in which it will be impossible to live permanently on other terms with any body. In this way people grow up unable to conceive as possible to them a state of total disregard of other people's interests."

Does this sentiment of fellow feeling find a place among the Hindus? The following facts throw a flood of light on this question.

The first fact that strikes one is the number of castes. No body has made an exact computation of their number. But it is estimated that total is not less than 2000. It might be 3000. This is not the only distressing aspect of this fact. There are others. Castes are divided into sub-castes. Their number is legion. The total population of the Brahmin Caste is about a crore and a half. But there are 1886 sub-castes of the Brahmin Caste. In the Punjab alone the Saraswat Brahmins of the Province of Punjab are divided into 469 sub-castes. The Kayasthas of Punjab are divided into 590 sub-castes. One could go on giving figures to show this infinite process of splitting social life into small fragments.

The third aspect of this splitting process is the infinitely small fragments into which the Castes are split. Some of the Baniya sub-castes can count no more than 100 families. They are so inter related they find extremely difficult to marry within their castes without transgressing the rules of consanguinity.

It is noteworthy what small excuses suffice to bring about this splitting.

Equally noteworthy is the hierarchical character of the Caste System. Castes form an hierarchy in which one caste is at the top and is the highest, another at the bottom and it is the lowest and in between there are castes every one of which is at once above some castes and below some castes. The caste system is a system of gradation in which every caste except the highest and the lowest has a priority and precedence over some other castes.

How is this precedence or this superiority determined? This order of superiority and inferiority or this insubordination is determined by Rules (1) which are connected with religious rites and (2) which are connected with commensuality.

Religion as a basis of Rules of precedence manifests itself in three ways. Firstly through religious ceremonies, secondly through incantations that accompany the religious ceremonies and thirdly through the position of the priest.

Beginning with the ceremonies as a source of rules of precedence it should be noted that the Hindu Scriptures prescribe sixteen religious ceremonies. Although those are Hindu ceremonies every Hindu Caste cannot by right claim to perform all the sixteen ceremonies. Few can claim the right to perform all. Some are allowed to perform certain ceremonies, some are not allowed to perform certain of the ceremonies. For instance take the ceremony of Upanayan, wearing of the sacred thread. Some castes can't. Precedence follows this distinction in the matter of right to perform the ceremonies. A caste which can claim to perform all the ceremonies is higher in status than the caste which has a right to perform a few.

Turning to the Mantras, it is another source for rules of precedence. According to the Hindu Religion the same ceremony can be performed in two different ways. (1) Vedokta and (2) Puranokta. In the Vedokta form the ceremonies are performed with Mantras (incantations) from the Vedas. In the Puranokta form the ceremony is performed with Mantras (incantations) from the Puranas. Hindu Religious Scriptures fall into two distinct categories (1) The Vedas which are four, and (2) the Puranas which are eighteen. Although they are all respected as scriptures they do not all have the same sanctity. The Vedas have the highest sanctity and the Puranas have the lowest sanctity. The way the Mantras give rise to social precedence will be obvious if it is borne in mind that not every caste is entitled to have the ceremony performed in the Vedokta form. Three castes may well claim the right to the performance of one of the sixteen ceremonies. But it will be that one of it is entitled to perform it in the Vedokta form, another in the Puranokta form. Precedence goes with the kind of Mantra that a caste is entitled to use in the performance of a religious ceremony. A caste which is entitled to use Vedic Mantras is superior to a caste which is entitled to use only Puranokta Mantras.

Taking the priest as a second source of precedence connected with Religion, Hinduism requires the instrumentality of a priest for the derivation of the full benefit from the performance of a religious ceremony. The priest appointed by the scripture is the Brahmin. A Brahmin therefore is indispensable. But the scriptures do not require that a Brahmin shall accept the invitation of any and every Hindu irrespective of his caste to officiate at a religious ceremony. The invitation of which caste he will accept and of which he will refuse is a matter left to the wishes of the Brahmin. By long and well established custom it is now settled at which caste he will officiate and at which caste he will not. This fact has become the basis of precedence as between castes. The caste at which a Brahmin will officiate is held as

superior to a caste at whose religious functions a Brahmin will not officiate.

The second source for rules of precedence is commensality. It will be noticed that rules of marriage have not given rise to rules of precedence as rules of commensality have. The reason lies in the distinction between the rules prohibiting intermarriage and interdining. That difference is obvious. The prohibition on intermarriage is such that it cannot only be respected but it can be carried out quite strictly. But the prohibition of interdining creates difficulties. It cannot be carried out quite strictly in all places and under all circumstances. Man migrates and must migrate from place to place. In every place he happens to go he may not find his castemen. He may find himself landed in the midst of strangers. Marriage is not a matter of urgency but food is. He can wait for getting himself married till he returns to the Society of his castemen. But he cannot wait for his food. He must find it from somewhere and from someone. Question arises from which caste he can take food, if he has to. The rule is that he will take food from a caste above him but will not take food from a caste which is below him. There is no way of finding how it came to be decided that a Hindu can take food from one caste and not from another. By long series of precedent every Hindu knows from what caste he can take food and from what caste he cannot. This is determined chiefly by the rule followed by the Brahmin. A caste is higher or lower according as the Brahmin takes from it food or not. In this connection the Brahmin has a very elaborate set of rules in the matter of food and water. (1) He will take only water from some and not from others. (2) A brahmin will not take food cooked in water by any caste. (3) He will take only food cooked in oil from some castes. Again he has a set of rules in the matter of the vessels, in which he will accept food and water. He will take food or water in an earthen vessel from some castes, only in metallic vessel from some and only in glass vessel from others. This goes to determine the level of the castes. If he takes food cooked in oil from a caste its status is higher than the caste from which he will not. If he takes water from a caste its status is higher than the caste from which he will not. If he takes water in a metallic vessel that caste is higher than the caste from which he will take water in an earthen vessel. Both these castes are higher than the caste from which he will take water in a glass vessel. Glass is a substance which is called (Nirlep) (which conserves no stain) therefore a Brahmin can take water in it even from the lowest. But other metals do conserve stains. Contaminating character of the stain depends upon the status of the person who has used it. That status depends upon the Brahmins will to accept water in that vessel.

These are some of the factors which determine the place and status of a caste in this Hindu hierarchical system of castes.

This hierarchical organization of the caste system is responsible for producing a social psychology which is noteworthy. In the first place it produces a spirit of rivalry among the different castes for dignity. Secondly it produces an ascending scale of hatred and descending scale of contempt.

This social psychology of mutual hatred and contempt is well illustrated by the innumerable proverbs that are flying about in India. As examples I record a few of them.\*

This spirit of hatred and contempt has not only found its place in proverbs but it has found its place in Hindu literature also. I refer to a Scripture known as the *Sahyadrikhand*. It is one of the Puranas which form a part of the Hindu Sacred literature. But its subject matter is totally foreign to the subject matter of other Puranas. It deals with the origin of the different castes. In doing so it assigns noble origin to other castes while it assigns to the Brahmin caste the filthiest origin. It was a revenge on Manu. It was worst lampoon on the Brahmins as a caste. The Peshwas very naturally ordered its destruction. Some survived the general destruction.

I will just record one more fact before I put the question.

Present day Hindus are probably the strongest opponents of Marxism. They are horrified at its doctrine of class-struggle. But they forget that India has been not merely the land of class struggle but she has been the land of class wars.

The bitterest class war took place between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas. The classical literature of the Hindus abounds in reference to class wars between these two Varnas.

The first recorded conflict was between the Brahmins and King Vena. Vena was the son of King Anga, of the race of Atri and was born of Sunitha, the daughter of Mrityu (Death). This son of the daughter of Kala (death), owing to the taint derived from his maternal grandfather, threw his duties behind his back, and lived in covetousness under the influence of desire. This king established an irreligious system of conduct; transgressing the ordinances of the Veda, he was devoted to lawlessness. In his reign men lived without study of the sacred books and the gods had no soma-libations to drink at sacrifices. 'I' he declared, 'am the object, and the performer of sacrifice, and the sacrifice itself; it is to me that sacrifice should be presented, and oblation offered'. This transgressor of the rules of duty, who arrogated to himself what was not his due, was then addressed by all the great rishis, headed by Marichi. 'We are about to consecrate

\* The proverbs are not mentioned in the MS—Editors.

ourselves for a ceremony which shall last for many years, practice not unrightousness, O Vena: this is not the eternal rule of duty. Thou art in every deed a Prajapati of Atri's race, and thou hast engaged to protect thy subjects.' The foolish Vena, ignorant of what was right, laughingly answered those great rishis who had so addressed him; 'Who but myself is the ordainer of duty or whom ought I to obey? Who on earth equals me in sacred knowledge, in prowess, in austere fervour, in truth? Ye who are deluded and senseless know not that I am the source of all beings and duties. Hesitate not to believe that I, if I willed, could burn up the earth, or deluge it with water, or close up heaven and earth.' When owing to his delusion and arrogance Vena could not be governed then the mighty rishis becoming incensed, seized the vigorous and struggling king, and rubbed his left thigh. From this thigh, so rubbed, was produced a black man, very short in stature, who, being alarmed, stood with joined hands. Seeing that he was agitated, Atri said to him 'Sit down' (Nishada). He became the founder of the race of the Nishadas, and also progenitor of the Dhivaras (fishermen), who sprang from the corruption of Vena. So two were produced from him the other inhabitants of the Vindhya range, the Tukharas and Tumburas, who are prone to lawlessness. Then the mighty sages, excited and incensed, again rubbed the right hand of Vena, as men do the Arani wood, and from it arose Pritha, respondent in body, glowing like the manifested Agni."

"The son of Vena (Pritha) then, with joined hands, addressed the great Rishis: 'A very slender understanding for perceiving the principles of duty has been given to me by nature; tell me truly how I must employ it. Doubt not that I shall perform whatever thy shall declare to me as my duty, and its object'. Then those gods and great rishis said to him: 'Whatever duty is enjoined perform it without hesitation, disregarding what though mayest like or dislike, looking on all creatures with an equal eye, putting far from thee lust, anger, cupidity and pride. Restrain by the strength of thine arm all those men who swerve from righteousness, having a constant regard to duty. And in thought, act, and word take upon thyself, and continually renew, the engagement to protect the terrestrial Brahman (Veda or Brahmins?). . . . . And promise that thou wilt exempt the Brahmans from punishment, and preserve society from the confusion of Castes'. The son of Vena then replied to the gods, headed by the rishis: 'The great Brahmans, the chief of men, shall be revered by me'. 'So be it,' rejoined those declares of the Veda. Sukra, the depository of divine knowledge, became his

Purohita; the Balakhilyas and Sarasvatyas his ministers; and the venerable Garga, the great rishi, his astrologer.

The second recorded conflict took place between the Brahmins and the Kshatriya king Pururavas. A brief reference to it occurs in the Adiparva of the Mahabharat.

Pururavas was born of Ila. Ruling over thirteen islands of the ocean, and surrounded by beings who were all superhuman, himself a man of great renown, Pururavas, intoxicated by his prowess engaged in a conflict with the Brahmins, and robbed them of their jewels, although they loudly remonstrated. Sanatkumara came from Brahma's heaven, and addressed to him an admonition, which however, he did not regard. Being then straightway cursed by the incensed rishis, he perished, this covetous monarch, who, through pride of power, had lost his understanding. This glorious being (virat), accompanied Urvashi, brought down for the performance of sacred rites the fires which existed in the heaven of the Gandharvas, properly distributed into three.

A third collision is reported to have occurred between the Brahmins and King Nahusha. The story is given in great details in the Udyogaparva of the Mahabharat. It is there recorded:

"After his slaughter of the demon Vrittra, Indra became alarmed at the idea of having taken the life of a Brahmin (for Vrittra was regarded as such), and hid himself in waters. In consequence of the disappearance of the king of gods, all affairs, celestial as well as terrestrial, fell into confusion. The rishis and Gods then applied to Nahusha to be their king. After at first excusing himself on the plea of want of power, Nahusha at length, in compliance with their solicitations, accepted the high function. Up to the period of his elevation he had led a virtuous life, but he now became addicted to amusement and sensual pleasure; and even aspired to the possession of Indrani, Indra's wife, whom he had happened to see. The queen resorted to the Angiras Vrihaspati, the preceptor of the Gods, who engaged to protect her. Nahusha was greatly incensed on hearing of this interference; but the Gods endeavoured to pacify him, and pointed out the immorality of appropriating another person's wife. Nahusha, however, would listen to no remonstrance, and insisted that in his adulterous designs he was not worse than Indra himself; "The renowned Ahalya, a rishi's wife, was formerly corrupted by Indra in her husband's lifetime; why was he not prevented by you? And many barbarous acts, and unrighteous deeds, and frauds were perpetrated of by old Indra; Why was he not prevented by you?" The Gods, urged by Nahusha, then went to bring Indrani; but Vrihaspati would not

give her up. At his recommendation, however, she solicited Nahusha for some delay, till she should ascertain what had become of her husband. This request was granted. The Gods next applied to Vishnu on behalf of Indra; and Vishnu promised that if Indra would sacrifice to him, he should be purged from his guilt, and recover his dominion, while Nahusha would be destroyed. Indra sacrificed accordingly; and the result is thus told; "Having divided the guilt of Brahmanicide among trees, rivers, mountains, the earth, women and the elements, Vasava (Indra), lord of the Gods, became freed from suffering and sin, and self governed." Nahusha was by this means, shaken from his place. But he must have speedily regained his position, as we are told that Indra was again ruined, and became invisible. Indrani now went in search of her husband; and by the help of Upasriti (the Goddess of night and revealer of secrets) discovered him existing in a very subtle form in the stem of a lotus growing in a lake situated in a continent within an ocean north of the Himalaya. She made known to him the wicked intention of Nahusha, and entreated him to exert his power, rescue her from danger, and resume his dominion. Indra declined any immediate interposition on the plea of Nahusha's superior strength; but suggested to his wife a device by which the usurper might be hurled from his position. She was recommended to say to Nahusha that "if he would visit her on a celestial vehicle borne by rishis, she would with pleasure submit herself to him". The question of the Gods accordingly went to Nahusha, by whom she was graciously received, and made this proposal: "I desire for thee, king of the Gods, a vehicle hitherto unknown, such as neither Vishnu, nor Rudra, nor the asuras, nor the rakshases employ. Let the eminent rishis, all united, bear thee, lord, in a car; this idea pleases me". Nahusha receives favourably this appeal to his vanity, and in the course of his reply thus gives utterance to his self congratulation: "He is a personage of no mean prowess who makes the *Munis* his bearers. I am a fervid devotee of great might, lord of the past, the future and the present. If I were angry the world would no longer stand; on me everything depends.... Wherefore, O Goddess I shall, without doubt, carry out what you propose. The seven rishis, and all the Brahman rishis, shall carry me. Behold beautiful Goddess, my majesty and my prosperity." The narrative goes on: "Accordingly this wicked being, irreligious, violent, intoxicated by the force of conceit, and arbitrary in his conduct, attached to his car the rishis, who submitted to his commands, and compelled them to bear him". Indrani then again resorts to Vrihaspati, who assures her that vengeance will soon overtake Nahusha for his presumption; and promises that he will himself perform a sacrifice with a view to the

destruction of the oppressor, and the discovery of Indra's lurking place. Agni is then sent to discover and bring Indra to Vrihaspati; and the latter, on Indra's arrival, informs him of all that had occurred during his absence. While Indra with Kuvera, Yama, Soma, and Varuna, was devising means for the destruction of Nahusha, the sage Agastya came up, congratulated Indra on the fall of his rival, and proceeded to relate how it had occurred: "Wearied with carrying the sinner Nahusha, the eminent divine rishis, and the spotless brahman-rishis asked that divine personage Nahusha (to solve) a difficulty: 'Dost thou, Vasava, most excellent of conquerors, regard as authoritative or not those Brahmana texts which are recited at the immolation of king?' 'No', replied Nahusha, whose understanding was enveloped in darkness. The rishis rejoined: 'Engaged in unrighteousness, thou attainest not unto righteousness: these texts, which were formerly uttered by great rishis, are regarded by us as authoritative.' The (proceeds Agastya) disputing with the munis, impelled by unrighteousness, touched me on the head with his foot. In consequence of this the king's glory was smitten and his prosperity departed. When he had instantly become agitated and oppressed with fear, I said to him, 'Since thou, O fool, condemnest that sacred text, always held in honour, which has been composed by former sages, and employed by Brahman-rishis, and hast touched my head with thy foot, and employest the Brahma—like and irresistible rishis as bearers to carry thee,—therefore, short of thy lustre and all thy merit exhausted, sink down, sinner, degraded from heaven to earth. For then thousand years thou shalt crawl in the form of a huge serpent. When that period is completed, thou shalt again ascend to heaven. 'So fell that wicked wretch from the sovereignty of the Gods."

Next there is a reference to the conflict between King Nimi and the Brahmins. The Vishnu Puran relates the story as follows:—

"Nimi had requested the Brahman-rishi Vasishtha to officiate at a sacrifice, which was to last a thousand years, Vasishtha in reply pleaded a pre-engagement to Indra for five hundred years, but promised to return at the end of that period. The king made no remark, and Vasishtha went away, supposing that he had assented to this arrangement. On his return, however, the priest discovered that Nimi had retained Gautama (who was equal with Vasishtha a Brahman-rishi) and others to perform the sacrifices; and being incensed at the neglect to give him notice of what was intended, he cursed the king, who was then asleep, to lose his corporeal form. When Nimi awoke and learnt that he had been cursed without any previous warning, he retorted, by uttering a similar curse on



Vasishtha, and then died. In consequence of this curse the vigour of Vasishtha, however, received from them another body when their seed had fallen from them at the sight of Urvasi. Nimi's body was emblamed. At the close of the sacrifice which he had begun, the Gods were willing, on the intercession of the priests, to restore him to life, but he declined the offer, and was placed by the deities, according to his desire, in the eyes of all living creatures. It is in consequence of this fact that they are always opening the shutting. (nimishas means "the twinkling of the eye")."

Manu mentions another conflict between the Brahmins and King Sumukha. But of this no details are available.

These are instances of conflict between the Brahmins and the Kshatriya Kings. From this it must not be supposed that the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas as two classes did not clash. That there were clashes between these two classes as distinguished from conflicts with kings is abundantly proved by material the historic value of which cannot be doubted. Reference may be made to three events.

First is the contest between two individuals Vishvamitra the Kshatriya and Vasishtha the Brahmin. The issue between the two was whether a Kshatriya can claim Brahmahood.

The story is told in Ramayana and is as follows:-

"There was formerly, we are told, a king called Kusa, son of Prajapati, who had a son called Kushanabha, who was father of Gadhi, the father of Visvamitra. The latter ruled the earth for many thousand years. On one occasion, when he was making a circuit of the earth, he came to Vasishtha's hermitage, the pleasant abode of many saints, sages, and holy devotees, where, after at first declining he allowed himself to be hospitably entertained with his followers. Visvamitra, however, coveting the wondrous cow, which had supplied all the dainties of the feast, first of all asked that she should be given to him in exchange for a hundred thousand common cows, adding that "she was a gem, that gems were the property of the king, and that, therefore, the cow was his by right". On this price being refused the king advances immensely in his offers, but all without effect. He then proceeds—very ungratefully and tyrannically, it must be allowed—to have the cow removed by force, but she breaks away from his attendants, and rushes back to her master, complaining that he was deserting her. He replied that he was not deserting her, but that the king was much more powerful than he. She answers, "Men do not ascribe strength to a Kshatriya; the Brahmins are stronger. The Strength of Brahmins is divine, and superior to that of Kshatriya. Thy strength is immeasurable. Visvamitra, though of great vigour, is not

more powerful than thou. Thy energy is invincible. Commission me, who have been acquired by the Brahmanical power, and I will destroy the pride, and force, and attempt of this wicked prince". She accordingly by her bellowing creates hundreds of Pahlavas, who destroy the entire host of Visvamitra, but are slain by him in their turn. Sakas and Yavans, of great power and valour, and well armed, were then produced, who consumed the king's soldiers, but were routed by him. The cow then calls into existence by her bellowing, and from different parts of her body, other warriors of various tribes, who again destroyed Visvamitra's entire army, foot soldiers, elephants, horses, chariots, and all. "A hundred of the monarch's sons, armed with various weapons, then rushed in great fury on Vashistha, but were all reduced to ashes in a moment by the blast of that sage's mouth. Vishvamitra, being thus utterly vanquished and humbled, appointed one of his sons to be regent, and travelled to the Himalaya, where he betook himself to austerities, and thereby obtained a vision of Mahadeva, who at his desire revealed to him the science of arms in all its branches, and gave him celestial weapons with which, elated and full of pride, he consumed the hermitage of Vashishtha, and put its inhabitants to flight. Vashishtha then threatens Vishvamitra and uplifts his Brahminical mace. Vishvamitra too, raises his fiery weapon and calls out to his adversary to stand. Vashishtha bids him to show his strength, and boasts that he will soon humble his pride. He asks: "What comparison is there between a Kshatriya's might, and the great might of a Brahman? Behold, thou contemptible Kshatriya, my divine Brahmanical power". The dreadful fiery weapon uplifted by the son of Gadhi was then quenched by the rod of the Brahman, as fire is by water. Many and various other celestial missiles, as the nooses of Brahma, Kala (time), and Varuna, the discus of Vishnu, and the trident Siva, were hurled by Vishvamitra at his antagonist, but the son of Brahma swallowed them up in his all-devouring mace. Finally, to the intense consternation of all the Gods, the warrior shot off the terrific weapon of Brahma (Brahmastra); but this was equally ineffectual against the Brahmanical sage. Vashishtha had now assumed a direful appearance: 'Jets of fire mingled with smoke darted from the pores of his body; the Brahminical mace blazed in his hand like a smokeless mundane conflagration, or a second sceptre of Yama'. Being appeased, however, by the munis, who proclaimed his superiority to his rival, the sage stayed his vengeance; and Vishvamitra exclaimed with a groan: 'Shame on a Kshatriya's strength; the strength of a Brahman's might alone is strength; by the single Brahmanical mace all my weapons have been destroyed.' No

alternative now remains, to the humiliated monarch, but either to acquiesce in this helpless inferiority, or to work out his own elevation to the Brahmanical order. He embraces the latter alternative: "Having pondered well this defeat, I shall betake myself, with composed senses and mind, to strenuous austere fervour, which shall exalt me to the rank of a Brahman". Intensely vexed and mortified, groaning and full of hatred against his enemy, he travelled with his queen to the south, and carried his resolution into effect; and we are first of all told that three sons Havishyanda, Madhusyanda, and Dridhanetra were born to him. At the end of a thousand years Brahma appeared, and announced that he had conquered the heaven of royal sages (Rajarshis); and, in consequence of his austere fervour, he was recognised as having attained that rank. Vishvamisra, however, was ashamed, grieved, and incensed at the offer of so very inadequate a reward, and exclaimed: "I have practised intense austerity, and the Gods and Rishis regard me only as a Rajarshi and not as a Brahman." There is conflict recorded between the same persons or different persons of the same name though on a somewhat different issue.

King Trisanku, one of Ikshvaku's descendants, had conceived the design of celebrating a sacrifice by virtue of which he should ascent bodily to heaven. As Vashistha, on being summoned, declared that the thing was impossible (asakyam), Trisanku travelled to the south, where the sage's hundred sons were engaged in austerities, and applied to them to do what their father had declined. Though he addressed them with the greatest reverence and humility, and added that "the Ikshvaku regarded their family—priests as their highest resource in difficulties, and that, after their father, he himself looked to them as his tutelary deities" he received from the haughty priests the following rebuke for his presumption: "Asakyam" "Fool, thou hast been refused by thy truth speaking preceptor. How is it that, disregarding his authority, thou hast resorted to another school (sakha). The family priest is the highest oracle of all the Ikshvakus; and the command of that veracious personages cannot be transgressed. Vashistha, the divine Rishi, has declared that 'the thing cannot be'; and how can we undertake thy sacrifice? Thou art foolish king; return to thy capital. The divine (Vashistha) is competent to act as priest of the three worlds; how can we shew him disrespect?" Trisanku then gave them to understand, that as his preceptor and "his preceptor's sons had declined compliance with his requests, he should think of some other expedient". In consequence of his venturing to express this presumptuous intention, they condemned him by their imprecation to become a Chandala. As this curse soon took effect, and the unhappy

king's form was changed into that of a degraded outcast, he resorted to Vishvamitra (who, as we have seen, was also dwelling at this period in the south), enlarging on his own virtues and piety, and bewailing his fate. Vishvamitra commiserated his condition, and promised to sacrifice on his behalf, and exalt him to heaven in the same Chandala form to which he had been condemned by his preceptor's curse. "Heaven is now as good as in thy possession, since thou hast resorted to the son of Kusika". He then directed that preparations should be made for the sacrifice, and that all the Rishis, including the family of Vashishtha should be invited to the ceremony. The disciples of Vishvamitra, who had conveyed his message, reported the result on their return in these words: "Having heard your message, all the Brahmans are assembling in all the countries, and have arrived, excepting Mahodaya (Vashishtha)? Hear what dreadful words those hundred Vashishthas, their voices quivering with rage, have uttered: "How can the Gods and Rishis consume the oblation at the sacrifice of that man, especially if he be a Chandala, for whom a Kshatriya is officiating priest? How can illustrious Brahmans ascend to heaven after eating the food of a Chandala, and being entertained by Vishvamitra?" These ruthless words all Vashishthas, together with Mahodaya, uttered, their eyes inflamed with anger. Vishvamitra, who was greatly incensed on receiving this, message by a curse doomed the sons of Vashishtha to be reduced to ashes, and reborn as degraded outcasts (mritapah) for seven hundred births, and Mahodaya to become a Nishada. Knowing that this curse had taken effect, Vishvamitra then after eulogizing Trisanku, proposed to the assembled Rishis that the sacrifice should be celebrated. To this they assented, being actuated by fear of the terrible sage's wrath. Vishvamitra himself officiated at the sacrifices as yajakas; and the other Rishis as priests (Ritvijah) (with other functions) performed all the ceremonies. Vishvamitra next invited the gods to partake of the oblations; "When, however, the deities did not come to receive their portions, Vishvamitra became full of wrath, and raising aloft the sacrificial ladle, thus addressed Trisanku: 'Behold, O monarch, the power of austere fervour acquired by my own efforts. I myself, by my own energy, will conduct thee to heaven. Ascend to that celestial region which is so arduous to attain in an earthly body. I have surely earned SOME reward of my austerity'." Trisanku ascended instantly to heaven in the sight of Munis. Indra, however, ordered him to be gone, as a person who, having incurred the curse of his spiritual preceptors, was unfit for the abode of the celestials:—and to fall down headlong to earth. He accordingly began to descend, invoking loudly, as he fell, the help of

his spiritual patron. Vishvamitra, greatly incensed, called out to him to stop: "Then by the power of his divine knowledge and austere fervour created, like another Prajapati, other Seven Rishis (a constellation so called) in the southern part of the sky. Having proceeded to this quarter of the heavens, the renowned sage, in the midst of the Rishis, formed another garland of stars, being overcome with fury. Exclaiming, 'I will create another Indra, or the world shall have no Indra at all', he began, in his rage, to call Gods also into being". The Rishis, Gods, (Suras), and Asuras now became seriously alarmed and said to Vishvamitra, in a conciliatory tone, that Trisanku, "as he had been cursed by his preceptors, should not be admitted bodily into heaven, until he had undergone some lustration". The sage replied that he had given a promise to Trisanku, and appealed to the Gods to permit his proteage to remain bodily in heaven, and the newly created stars to retain their places in perpetuity. The Gods agreed that "these numerous stars should remain, but beyond the Sun's path, and that Trisanku, like an immortal, with his head downwards should shine among them, and be followed by them", adding "that his object would be thus attained, and his renown secured, and he would be like a dweller in heaven". Thus was this great dispute adjusted by a compromise, which Vishvamitra accepted.<sup>1</sup>

When all the Gods and rishis had departed at the conclusion of the sacrifice, Vishvamitra said to his attendant devotees; "This has been a great interruption (to our austerities) which has occurred in the southern region: we must proceed in another direction to continue our penances". He accordingly went to a forest in the west, and began his austerities anew. Here the narrative is again interrupted by the introduction of another story, that of king Ambarisha, king of Ayodhya, who was, according to the Ramayana, the twenty eighth in descent from Ikshvaku, and the twenty second from Trisanku. Vishvamitra is nevertheless represented as flourishing contemporaneously with both of these princes. The story relates that Ambarisha was engaged in performing a sacrifice, when Indra carried away the victim. The priest said that this ill-omened event had occurred owing to the king's bad administration; and would call for a great expiation, unless a human victim could be produced. After a long search the royal rishi (Ambarisha) came upon the Brahmin-rishi Richika, a descendant of Bhrigu, and asked him to sell one of his sons for a victim, at the price of a hundred thousand cows. Richika answered that he would not sell his eldest son; and his wife added that

<sup>1</sup> This is the story of Trisanku. It will have been observed, it differs materially from the one quoted above from Harivansa; but brings out more distinctly the character of the conflict between Vashishtha and Vishvamitra.

she would not sell the youngest: "Eldest sons," she observed, "being generally the favourites of their fathers, and youngest sons of their mothers". The second son, Sunassepa then said that in that case he regarded himself as the one who was to be sold, and desired the king to remove him. The hundred thousand cows, with ten millions of gold pieces and heaps of jewels, were paid down, and Sunassepa was carried away. As they were passing through Puskara, Sunassepa beheld his maternal uncle Vishvamitra who was engaged in austerities there with other rishis, threw himself into his arms, and implored his assistance, urging his orphan, friendless, and helpless state, as claims on the sage's benevolence. Vishvamitra soothed him; and pressed his own sons to offer themselves as victims in the room of Sunassepa. This proposition met with no favour from Madhushanda and the other sons of the royal hermit, who answered with haughtiness and derision: "How is it that thou sacrificest thine own sons, and seekest to rescue those of others? We look upon this as wrong, and like the eating of one's own flesh". The sage was exceedingly wrath at this disregard of his injunction, and doomed his sons to be born in the most degraded classes, like Vashishtha's sons, and to eat dog's flesh, for a thousand years. He then said to Sunassepa: "When thou art bound with hallowed cords, decked with a red garland, and anointed with unguents, and fastened to the sacrificial post of Vishnu, then address thyself to Agni, and sing these two divine verses (gathas), at the sacrifice of Ambarisha; then shall thou attain the fulfilment of thy desire". Being furnished with the two gathas, Sunassepa proposed at once to King Ambarisha that they should set out for their destination. Then bound at the stake to be immolated, dressed in a red garment, "he celebrated the two Gods, Indra and his younger brother (Vishnu), with the excellent verses. The thousand-eyed (Indra) was pleased with the sacred hymn, and bestowed long life on Sunassepa". King Ambarisha also received great benefits from this sacrifice. Vishvamitra meanwhile proceeded with his austerities, which he prolonged for a thousand years. "At the end of this time the Gods came to allot his reward; and Brahma announced that he had attained the rank of a rishi, thus apparently advancing an additional step. Dissatisfied, as it would seem, with this, the sage commenced his task of penance anew. After a length of time he beheld the nymph (Apsara) Menka, who had come to bathe in the lake of Pushkara. She flashed on his view, unequalled in her radiant beauty, like lightning in a cloud. He was smitten by her charms, invited her to be his companion in his hermitage, and for ten years remained a slave to her witchery, to the great prejudice of his austerities. At length he became ashamed of this ignoble subjection, and full of indignation at

what he believed to be a device of the Gods to disturb his devotion ; and, dismissing the nymph with gentle accents, he departed for the northern mountains, where he practised severe austerities for a thousand years on the banks of the Kausiki river. The Gods became alarmed at the progress he was making, and decided that he should be dignified with the appellation of great rishi (Maharshi) ; and Brahma, giving effect to the general opinion of the deities, announced that he had conferred that rank upon him. Joining his hands and bowing his head, Vishvamitra replied that he should consider himself to have indeed completely subdued his senses, if the incomparable title of Brahmin-rishi were conferred upon him. Brahma informed him in answer, that he had not yet acquired the power of perfectly controlling his senses ; but should make further efforts with that view. The sage then began to put himself through a yet more rigorous course of austerities, standing with his arms erect, without support, feeding on air, in summer exposed to five fires (i.e. one on each of four sides, and the sun overhead), in the rainy season remaining unsheltered from the wet, and in winter lying on a watery couch night and day. This he continued for a thousand years. At last Indra and the other deities became greatly distressed at the idea of the merit he was storing up, and the power which he was thereby acquiring ; and the chief of the celestials desired the nymph Rambha to go and bewitch him by her blandishments. She expressed great reluctance to expose herself to the wrath of the formidable muni, but obeyed the repeated injunction of Indra, who promised that he and Kandarpa (the God of love) should stand by her, and assumed her most attractive aspect with the view of overcoming the sage's impassibility. He, however, suspected this design, and becoming greatly incensed, he doomed the nymph by a curse to be turned into stone and to continue in that state for a thousand years. The curse took effect, and Kandarpa and Indra sunk away. In this way, though he resisted the allurements of sensual love, he lost the whole fruit of his austerities by yielding to anger ; and had to begin his work over again. He resolved to check his irresistibility, to remain silent, not even to breathe for hundreds of years ; to dry up his body ; and to fast and stop his breath till he had obtained the coveted character of a Brahmin. He then left the Himalaya and travelled to the east, where he underwent a dreadful exercise, unequalled in the whole history of austerities, maintaining silence, according to a vow, for a thousand years. At the end of this time he had attained to perfection, and although thwarted by many obstacles, he remained unmoved by anger. On the expiration of this course of austerity, he prepared some food to eat ; which Indra, coming in the form of a Brahmin, begged

that he would give him. Vishvamitra did so, and though he had done left for himself, and was obliged to remain fasting, he said nothing to the Brahmin, on account of his vow of silence. "As he continued to suspend his breath, smoke issued from his head, to the great consternation and distress of the three worlds." The Gods, rishis, etc., then addressed Brahma. "The great muni Vishvamitra has been allured and provoked in various ways, but still advances in his sanctity. If his wish is not conceded, he will destroy the three worlds by the force of his austerity. All the regions of the universe are confounded, no light anywhere shines; all the oceans are tossed, and the mountains crumble, the earth quakes, and the wind blows confusedly. We cannot, O Brahma, guarantee that mankind shall not become atheistic. . . . Before the great and glorious sage of fiery form resolves to destroy (everything) let him be propitiated." The Gods, headed by Brahma, then addressed Vishvamitra: 'Hail, Brahman rishi, we are gratified by the austerity; O Kausika, thou hast, through their intensity, attained to Brahmahood. I, O Brahman, associated with the Maruts, confers on thee long life. May every blessing attend thee; depart wherever thou wilt.' The sage, delighted, made his obeisance to the Gods, and said: 'If I have obtained Brahmahood, and long life, then let the mystic monosyllable (omkara) and the sacrificial formula (vashatkara) and the Vedas recognise me in that capacity. And let Vashishtha, the son of Brahmin, the most eminent of those who are skilled in the Kshatra-Veda, and the Brahma-Veda (the knowledge of the Kshatriya and the Brahmnical disciplines), address me similarly'. . . . Accordingly Vashishtha, being propitiated by the Gods, became reconciled to Vishvamitra, and recognised his claim to all the prerogatives of a Brahman rishi. . . . Vishvamitra, too having attained the Brahmnical rank, paid all honour to Vashishtha".

The second event has a reference to the slaughter of the Brahmins by the Kshatriyas. It is related in the Adiparva of the Mahabharat from which the following account is taken:—

"There was a King named Kritravya, by whose liberality the Bhrigus, learned in the Vedas, who officiated as his priests, had been greatly enriched with corn and money. After he had gone to heaven, his descendants were in want of money, and came to beg for a supply from the Bhrigus, of whose wealth they were aware. Some of the latter hid their money under ground, others bestowed it on Brahmins, being afraid of the Kshatriyas, while others again gave these last what they wanted. It happened, however, that a Kshatriya, while digging the ground, discovered some money buried in the house of Bhrigu. The Kshatriyas then assembled and saw this treasure, and, being incensed,



slew in consequence all the Bhrigus, who they regarded with contempt, down to the children in the womb. The widows, however, fled to the Himalaya mountains. One of them concealed her unborn child in her thigh. The Kshatriya, hearing of its existence from a Brahmani informant, sought to kill it; but it issued forth from its mother's thigh with lustre, and blinded the persecutors. After wandering about bewildered among the mountains for a time, they humbly supplicated the mother of the child for the restoration of their sight; but she referred them to her wonderful infant Aurva into whom the whole Veda, with its six Vedangas, had entered as the person who (in retaliation of the slaughter of his relatives) had robbed them of their eyesight, and who alone could restore it. They accordingly had recourse to him, and their eyesight was restored. Aurva, however, meditated the destruction of all living creatures, in revenge for the slaughter of the Bhrigus, and entered on a course of austerities which alarmed both Gods, Asuras, and men; but his progenitors (Pitris) themselves appeared, and sought to turn him from his purpose by saying that they had no desire to be revenged on the Kshatriyas: "It was not from weakness that the devout Bhrigus overlooked the massacre perpetrated by the murderous Kshatriyas. When we became distressed by old age, we ourselves desired to be slaughtered by them. The money which was buried by someone in a Bhrigu's house was placed there for the purpose of exciting hatred, by those who wished to provoke the Kshatriyas. For what had we, who were desiring heaven, to do with money?" They added that they hit upon this device because they did not wish to be guilty of suicide, and concluded by calling upon Aurva to restrain his wrath; and abstain from the sin he was meditating, "Destroy not the Kshatriyas. Oh, son, nor the seven worlds. Suppress thy kindled anger which nullifies the power of austere fervour." Aurva, however, replies that he cannot allow his threat to remain unexecuted. His anger, unless wreaked upon some other object, will, he says, consume himself. And he argues on grounds of justice, expediency, and duty, against the clemency which his progenitors recommend. He is, however, persuaded by the Pitris to throw the fire of his anger into the sea, where they say it will find exercise in assailing the watery element, and in this way his threat will be fulfilled."

The third event has reference to the slaughter of the Kshatriyas by the Brahmins. This story is told in several places in the Mahabharat.

The magnificent and mighty Kartavirya, possessing a thousand arms, was lord of this whole world, living in Mahishmati. This Haihaya of unquestioned valour ruled over the whole sea-girt earth, with its oceans and continents. He obtained boons from the Muni Dattatreya, a thousand arms whenever he should go into battle, power to make the conquest of the whole earth, a disposition to rule it with

justice and the promise of instruction from the virtuous in the event of his going astray. "Then ascending his chariot glorious as the resplendent Sun, he exclaimed in the intoxication of his prowess, 'Who is like me in fortitude, courage, fame, herosim, energy, and vigour?' At the end of this speech a bodyless voice in the sky addressed him: 'Thou knowest not, O fool, that a Brahman is better than Kshatriya. It is with the help of the Brahman that the Kshatriya rules his subjects.' Arjuna answers: 'If I am pleased, I can create, or, if displeased, annihilate living beings; and no Brahman is superior to me in act, thought or word. The first proposition is that the Brahmins are superior; the second that the Kshatriyas are superior; both of these thou hast stated with their grounds, but there is a difference between them (in point of force). The Brahmins are dependent on the Kshatriyas and not the Kshatriyas on the Brahmins, who wait upon them, and only make the Vedas a pretence. Justice, the protection of the people, has its seat in the Kshatriyas. From them the Brahmins derive their livelihood; how then can the latter be superior? I always keep in subjection myself those Brahmins, the chief of all beings, who subsist on alms, and who have a high opinion of themselves. For truth was spoken by that female the Gayatri in the sky. I shall subdue all those unruly Brahmins clad in hides. No one in the three worlds, god or man, can hurl me from my royal authority; therefore I am superior to any Brahman. Now shall I turn the world in which Brahmins have the upper hand into a place where Kshatriyas shall have the upper hand; for no one dares to encounter my force in battle.' Hearing this speech of Arjun, the female roving in the night became alarmed. Then Vayu hovering in the air, said to Arjuna: 'Abandon this sinful disposition, and do obeisance to the Brahmins. If thou shalt do them wrong, thy kingdom shall be convulsed. They will subdue thee; those powerful men will humble thee, and expel thee from thy country.' The King asks him, 'Who art thou?' Vayu replies, 'I am Vayu, the messenger of the Gods, and tell thee what is for thy benefit.' Arjuna rejoins, 'Oh, thou displayest today a great warmth of devotion to the Brahmins. But say that a Brahman is like (any other) earth-born creature."

This king came into conflict with Parsuram the son of a Brahman sage Jamadagni. The history of this conflict is as follows:—

There lived a king of Kanyakubja, called Gadhi, who had a daughter named Satyavati. The marriage of this princess to the rishi Richika, and the birth of Jamadagni, are then told in nearly the same way as above narrated. Jamadagni and Satyavati had five sons, the youngest of whom was the redoubtable Parasuram. By his father's command he

kills his mother (who, by the indulgence of impure desire, had fallen from her previous sanctity), after the four elder sons had refused this matricidal offence, and had in consequence been deprived of reason by their father's curse. At Parasuram's desire, however, his mother is restored by his father to life, and his brothers to reason; and he himself is absolved from all the guilt of murder; and obtains the boon of invincibility and long life from his father. His history now begins to be connected with that of king Arjuna (or Kartavirya). The latter had come to Jamadagni's hermitage, and had been respectfully received by his wife; but he had requited this honour by carrying away by force the calf of the sage's sacrificial cow, and breaking down his lofty trees. On being informed of this violence, Parasurama was filled with indignation, attacked Arjuna, cut off his thousand arms, and slew him. Arjuna's sons, in return slew the peaceful sage Jamadagni, in the absence of Parasuram.

Rama, after performing, on his return, his father's funeral obsequies, vowed to destroy the whole Kshatriya race; and executed his threat by killing first Arjun's sons and their followers. Twenty one times did he sweep away all the Kshatriyas from the earth, and formed five lakes of blood in Samantpanchaka; in which he satiated the manes of the Bhrigus, and beheld face to face (his grandfather), Richika, who addressed himself to Rama. The latter gratified Indra by offering to him a grand sacrifice, and gave the earth to the officiating priests. He bestowed also a golden altar, ten fathoms long and nine high, on the mighty Kasyapa. This, by his permission, the Brahmins divided among themselves, deriving thence the name of Khandavavanas. Having given away the earth to Kasyapa, Parasuram himself dwells on the mountain Mahendra. Thus did enmity arise between him and Kshatriyas, and thus was the earth conquered by Parasuram of boundless might."

The Kshatriyas who were slain by Parasuram are described in the Dronaparvan of the Mahabharata as of various provinces, viz., Kasmiras, Daradas, Kuntis, Kshudrakas, Malavas, Angas, Vangas, Kalingas, Videhas, Tamraliptakas, Marttikavatas, Sivis and other Rajanyas.

The means by which the Kshattriya race was restored is also told as part of this story of annihilation of the Kshatriyas by the Brahmins. It is said:—

"Having one and twenty times swept away all the Kshatriyas from the earth, the son of Jamdagni engaged in austerities on Mahendra the most excellent of mountains. After he had cleared the world of Kshatriyas, their widows came to the Brahmins, praying for offspring. The religious Brahmins, free from any impulse of lust

cohabited at the proper seasons with these women, who in consequence became pregnant, and brought forth valiant Kshatriya boys and girls, to continue the Kshatriya stock. Thus was the Kshatriya race virtuously begotten by Brahmins on Kshatriya women, and became multiplied and long lived. Thence there arose four castes inferior to the Brahmins."

No country has such a dismal record of class war as Hindustan. It was the proud boast of the Brahmin Parsuram that he exterminated the Kshatriyas twenty one times from the face of Hindustan and recreated them by Brahmans cohabiting with the widows of the Kshatriyas.

It must not be supposed that this Class War in India is a matter of ancient History. It has been present all along. Its existence was very much noticeable in Maharashtra during the Maratha Rule. It destroyed the Maratha Empire. It must not be supposed that these class Wars were like ordinary wars which are a momentary phenomena which come and go and which leave no permanent chasms to divide the peoples of the different nations. In India the class war is a permanent phenomenon which is silently but surely working its way. It is a grain in the life and it has become genius of the Hindus.

These facts it will not be denied are symptomatic in the sense they indicate health and character. Do they suggest that there is fraternity among Hindus? In the face of these facts I am sure it would be impossible to give an affirmative answer.

What is the explanation of this absence of fraternity among the Hindus? It is Hinduism and its philosophy that is responsible for it. The sentiment of fraternity as Mill said is natural but it is a plant which grows only where the soil is propitious and the conditions for its growth exist. The fundamental condition for the growth of the sentiment of fraternity is not preaching that we are children of God or the realization that one's life is dependent upon others. It is too rational to give rise to a sentiment. The condition for the growth of this sentiment of fraternity lies in sharing in the vital processes of life. It is sharing in the joys and sorrows of birth, death, marriage and food. Those who participate in these come to feel as brothers. Prof. Smith very rightly emphasizes the importance of sharing food as a prime factor in the creation of community feeling when he says;

"The sacrificial meal was an appropriate expression of the antique ideal of religious life, not merely because it was a social act and in which the God and his worshippers were conceived as partaking together, but because, as has already been said, the very

act of eating and drinking with a man was a symbol and a confirmation of fellowship and mutual social obligations. The one thing directly expressed in the sacrificial meal is that the God and his worshippers are commensals but every other point in their mutual relations is included in what this involves. Those who sit at meal together are united for all social effects; those who do not eat together are aliens to one another, without fellowship in religion and without reciprocal social duties".<sup>1</sup>

There is no sharing among Hindus of joys and sorrows involved in the vital facts of life. Everything is separate and exclusive. The Hindu is separate and exclusive all through his life. A foreigner coming to India will not find men crying Hindu Pani (water for Hindus) and Musalman Pani (water for Musalmans). He will find Brahmin Coffee Houses, Brahmin Eating Houses, where no non-Brahmin Hindus can go. He will find Brahmin Maternity Homes, Maratha Maternity Homes and Bhatia Maternity Homes although Brahmins, Marathas and Bhatias are all Hindus. If there is a birth at the house of a Brahmin, no non-Brahmin will be invited nor will he feel the desire to join. If there is marriage in the family of a Brahmin, no non-Brahmin will be invited nor will he feel the desire to join if a Brahmin dies, no non-Brahmin will be invited to join the funeral nor will he think it necessary to join in the procession. If there is a festivity in the house of a Brahmin, no non-Brahmin will be called and no non-Brahmin will feel any wrong about it. Joys and sorrows of one caste are not the joys and sorrows of another. One caste has no concern with other castes. Even charity has become caste bound. Among Hindus there is no public charity in the sense of its benefit being open to all. You have Brahmin Charity for Brahmins. Within that you have Chitpavan Brahmin Charity for Chitpavan Brahmins only. Deshastha Brahmin Charity for Deshastha Brahmins only, Karhada Brahmin Charity for Karhada Brahmins only. You have Sarasvat Brahmin Charity. Within that you have Kudaldeshkar Brahmin Charity. One could go on with such instances *ad nauseum* to show the exclusive character of Hindu Charity—rather Charity among Hindus—for there is no such thing as Hindu Charity. Thus one Hindu will share nothing with another Hindu while they are alive. But they will be separate and exclusive even when they are dead. Some Hindus bury their dead. Some Hindus burn their dead. But those bury will not share the same cemetery. Each will appropriate a part of the cemetery to bury its dead. Those who burn will not burn at the same burning place. If they do, each will have a separate funeral pan.

Is there any wonder that the sentiment of fraternity is foreign to the Hindus? With a complete refusal to share the joys and sorrows of life how can the sentiment of fraternity take roots?

<sup>1</sup> The Religion of the Semites—p.269.

But the question of all questions is why do the Hindus refuse to share the joys and sorrows of life? It needs no saying that he refuses to share because his religion tells him not to share them. This conclusion need cause no surprize. For what does Hinduism teach? It teaches not to interdine, not to inermarry, not to associate. These don'ts constitute the essence of its teaching. All the shameful facts I have referred to, to illustrate the separate and exclusive character of the Hindus is the direct outcome of this philosophy of Hinduism. The philosophy of Hinduism is a direct denial of fraternity.

This brief analysis of the Philosophy of Hinduism from the point of view of justice reveals in a glaring manner how Hinduism is inimical to equality, antagonistic to liberty and opposed to fraternity.

Fraternity and liberty are really derivative notions. The basic and fundamental conceptions are equality and respect for human personality. Fraternity and liberty take their roots in these two fundamental conceptions. Digging further down it may be said that equality is the original notion and respect for human personality is a reflexion of it. So that where equality is denied, everything else may be taken to be denied. In other words it was enough for me to have shown that there was no equality in Hinduism. But as Hinduism has not been examined so far in the manner I have done, I did not think it sufficient to leave it to implication that Hinduism was a denial of Fraternity and Liberty as well.

There is one final observation with which I wish to conclude this discussion with the profound observation of Lord Acton. The great Lord says that inequality has grown as a result of historical circumstances. It has never been adopted as a creed. It is obvious that in making this observation Lord Acton must have omitted to take note of Hinduism. For in Hinduism inequality is a religious doctrine adopted and conscientiously preached as a sacred dogma. It is an official creed and nobody is ashamed to profess it openly. Inequality for the Hindus is a divinely prescribed way of life as a religious doctrine and as a prescribed way of life, it has become incarnate in Hindu Society and is shaped and moulded by it in its thoughts and in its doings. Indeed inequality is the Soul of Hinduism.

Let me now turn to the examination of the philosophy of Hinduism from the point of view of Utility.

This examination of Hinduism from this aspect need not be long and detailed. For as Mill pointed out there is no necessary antagonism between justice and utility. In other words what is unjust to the individual cannot be useful to society. Apart from this we have before us the consequences of caste staring us in the face.

The ideal of caste was not mere ideal. The ideal was put into practice; was therefore something real. So that, in the matter of the Chaturvarna the Hindus have very faithfully followed the German Philosopher Nietzsche who said "Realize the ideal and idealize the real".

The value of the ideal must be tested by its results. If experience therefore must be the criterion then the ideal of Chaturvarna stands thrice condemned. Purely as a form of social organization it stands condemned. As a producer's organization it stands discredited. As an ideal scheme of distribution it has miserably failed. If it is an ideal form of organization how is it that the Hinduism has been unable to form a common front. If it is an ideal form of production, how is it that its technique never advanced beyond that of the primitive man. If it is an ideal form of distribution, how is it that it has produced appalling inequality of wealth, immense wealth side by side extreme poverty.

But I do not wish to dismiss the subject so summarily, for I know many Hindus who claim great social utility to the institution of caste and praise Manu for having been so wise and so thoughtful not only in devising it but in giving it a divine sanction.

This view of the caste is due to taking the separate aspects of caste separately. One must take them in conjunction. The resultant social utility or disutility of caste can be ascertained only by putting together the separate aspects of caste and judge them in their combination. Following this line of attacking the problem, the following conclusions follow :—

(1) Caste divides Labourers (2) Caste disassociates work from interest (3) Caste disconnects intelligence from manual labour (4) Caste devitalises by denying to him the right to cultivate vital interest and (5) Caste prevents mobilization. Caste System is not merely division of labour. **IT IS ALSO A DIVISION OF LABOURERS.** Civilized society undoubtedly needs division of labour. But in no civilized society is division of labour accompanied by this unnatural division of labourers into water-tight compartments. Caste System is not merely a division of labourers—which is quite different from division of labour—it is an hierarchy in which the divisions of labourers are graded one above the other. In no other country is the division of labour accompanied by this gradation of labourers. There is also a third point of criticism against this view of the Caste System. This division of labour is not spontaneous, it is not based on natural aptitudes. Social and individual efficiency requires us to develop the capacity of an individual to the point of competency to choose and to

make his own career. This principle is violated in the Caste System in so far as it involves an attempt to appoint tasks to individuals in advance, selected not on the basis of trained original capacities, but on that of the social status of the parents. Looked at from another point of view this stratification of occupations which is the result of the Caste System is positively pernicious. Industry is never static. It undergoes rapid and abrupt changes. With such changes an individual must be free to change his occupations. Without such freedom to adjust himself to changing circumstances it would be impossible for him to gain his livelihood. Now the Caste System will not allow Hindus to take occupations where they are wanted if they do not belong to them by heredity. If a Hindu is seen to starve rather than take to new occupations not assigned to his Caste, the reason is to be found in the Caste System. By not permitting readjustment of occupations, caste becomes a direct cause of much of the unemployment we see in the country. As a form of division of labour the Caste System suffers from another serious defect. The division of labour brought about by the Caste System is not a division based on choice. Individual sentiment, individual preference has no place in it. It is based on the dogma of predestination. Considerations of social efficiency would compel us to recognize that the greatest evil in the industrial system is not so much poverty and the suffering that it involves, as the fact that so many persons have callings which make no appeal to those who are engaged in them. Such callings constantly provoke one to aversion, ill will and the desire to evade. There are many occupations in India which on account of the fact that they are regarded as degraded by the Hindus provoke those who are engaged in it to aversion. There is a constant desire to evade and escape from such occupations which arises solely because of the blighting effect which they produce upon those who follow them owing to the slight and stigma cast upon them by the Hindu religion.

The second mischief it does is to dissociate intelligence from work and create contempt for labour. The theory of the Caste is that a Brahmin who is permitted to cultivate his intellect is not permitted to labour, indeed is taught to look down upon labour. While the Shudra who is required to labour is not permitted to cultivate his intelligence. The disastrous consequences of this have been well portrayed by Mr. R. C. Dutt.\* . . . .

Caste devitalizes a man. It is a process of sterilization. Education, wealth, labour are all necessary for every individual if he is to reach a free and full manhood. Mere education without wealth and labour is

\* Quotation not given in the MS.—Editors



barren. Wealth without education and wealth is brutal. Each is necessary to every one. They are necessary for the growth of a man.

That the Brahmin should cultivate knowledge, Kshatriya should bear arms, the Vaishya should trade and that the Shudra should serve is presented as a theory of mutual interdependence found in the family. It is asked why should the Shudra need trouble to acquire wealth when the three Varnas are there to support him; Why need the Shudra bother to take to education when the Brahmin to whom he can go when the occasion for reading or writing arises; Why need the Shudra worry to arm himself because there is the Kshatriya to protect him? The theory of Chaturvarnya understood in this sense may be said to look upon the Shudra as the ward and the three Varnas as his guardians. Thus interpreted it is a simple and alluring theory. Assuming this to be the correct view of the underlying conception of Chaturvarnya it seems to me that the system is neither fool-proof nor knave-proof. What is to happen if the Brahmins, Vaishyas and Kshatriyas fail to pursue knowledge, to engage in economic enterprises and to be efficient soldiers which are their respective functions? Contrarywise, suppose that they discharge their functions but flout their duty to the Shudra or to one another? What is to happen to the Shudra if the three classes refuse to support him on fair terms or combine to keep him down? Who is to safeguard the interests of the Shudra or for the matter of that of the Vaishya and Kshatriya when the person who is trying to take advantage of his ignorance is the Brahmin? Who is to defend the liberty of the Shudra or that of the Brahmin and the Vaishya, when the person who is robbing him of it is the Kshatriya? Inter-dependence of one class on another class is inevitable. Even dependence of one class upon another may sometimes become allowable. But why make one person depend upon another in the matter of his vital needs? Education every one must have. Means of defence every one must have. These are the paramount requirements of every man for his self-preservation. How can the fact that his neighbour is educated and armed, help a man who is uneducated and disarmed. The whole theory is absurd. These are the questions which the defenders of Chaturvarnya do not seem to be troubled about. But they are very pertinent questions. Assuming their conception of Chaturvarnya that the relationship between the different classes is that of ward and guardian is the real conception underlying Chaturvarnya, it must be admitted that it makes no provision to safeguard the interests of the ward from the misdeeds of the guardian. Whether the relationship of guardian and ward was the real underlying conception on which Chaturvarnya was based there is no doubt that in practice

the relation was that of master and servant. The three classes, Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas although not very happy in their mutual relationship managed to work by compromise. The Brahmin flattered the Kshatriya and both let the Vaishya live in order to be able to live upon him. But the three agreed to beat down the Shudra. He was not allowed to acquire wealth lest he should be independent of the three Varnas. He was prohibited from acquiring knowledge lest he should keep a steady vigil regarding his interests. He was prohibited from bearing arms lest he should have the means to rebel against their authority. That this is how the Shudras were treated by the Trayavarnikas is evidenced by the Laws of Manu. There is no code of laws more infamous regarding social rights than the Laws of Manu. Any instance from anywhere of social injustice must pale before it. Why have the mass of people tolerated the social evils to which they have been subjected? There have been social revolutions in other countries of the world. Why have there not been social revolutions in India is a question which has incessantly troubled me. There is only one answer which I can give and it is that the lower classes of Hindus have been completely disabled for direct action on account of this wretched system of Chaturvarnya. They could not bear arms and without arms they could not rebel. They were all ploughmen or rather condemned to be ploughmen and they were allowed to convert their ploughshares into swords. They had no bayonets and therefore everyone who chose ploughs did sit upon them. On account of the Chaturvarnya they could receive no education. They could not think out or know the way to their salvation. They were condemned to be lowly and not knowing the way of escape and not having the means of escape, they became reconciled to eternal servitudes which they accepted as their inescapable fate. It is true that even in Europe the strong has not shrunk from the exploitation, nay the spoliation of the weak but in Europe, the strong have never contrived to make the weak helpless against exploitation so shamelessly as was the case in India among the Hindus. Social war has been raging between the strong and the weak far more violently in Europe than it has ever been in India. Yet the weak in Europe has had in him freedom of military service his physical weapon, in suffrage his political weapon and in education his moral weapon. Three weapons for emancipation were never withheld by the strong from the weak in Europe. All these weapons were however denied to the masses in India by Chaturvarnya. There cannot be a more degrading system of social organization than Chaturvarnya. It is the system which deadens, paralyses and cripples the people from helpful activity. This is no exaggeration. History bears ample evidence.

There is only one period in Indian history which is a period of freedom, greatness and glory. That is the period of the Mourya Empire. At all other times the country suffered from defeat and darkness. But the Mourya period was a period when Chaturvarnya was completely annihilated, when the Shudras, who constituted the mass of the people came into their own and became the rulers of the country. The period of defeat and darkness is the period when Chaturvarnya flourished to the damnation of the greater part of the people of the country.

Caste prevents mobilization. Occasions arise when society must mobilize all its resources to one end in order to save itself from a catastrophe. To take a catastrophe like war, Society must mobilize all its resources for militarization. Every one must do war. Every one must be a soldier. Is this possible under the theory of caste? Obviously not. Indeed the destiny of a defeat which has been the lot of India throughout history is due to caste. Caste prevented general mobilization. Or the extent of mobilization was of a very limited character. Only the Kshatriyas were expected to fight. The rest the Brahmins and the Vaishyas were not armed and the Shudras who formed the large majority of the country were disarmed. The result was that once the small class of Kshatriyas were defeated by a foreign foe the whole country fell at his feet. It could offer no resistance. It was not capable of resistance. Indian wars have been mostly wars of single battles or single campaigns. This was due to the fact that once the Kshatriyas fell everything fell. Why? Simply because there was no general mobilization and the theory deeply imbedded in the psychology of the people.

If these conclusions are sound, how can a philosophy which dissects society in fragments, which dissociates work from interest, which disconnects intelligence from labour, which expropriates the rights of man to interests vital to life and which prevented society from mobilizing resources for common action in the hour of danger, be said to satisfy the test of Social Utility.

#### IV

The Philosophy of Hinduism therefore neither satisfies the test of social utility nor does it satisfy the test of individual justice.

The result of my analysis is so odd that it will surprise many. Astonished some may even say that if the conclusions are so odd then there must be something wrong in my analysis of the philosophy of Hinduism. I must meet this objection. To those who refuse to accept

my analysis I say that they find my analysis odd because they do not have a correct notion what is central in the philosophy of Hinduism. If they do they will feel no surprise at my conclusions.

This matter is so important that I must stop to explain it. It may be recalled that the foregoing analysis of the religious revolution showed that religious ideals as forms of divine governance for human Society fall into two classes, one in which Society is the centre and the other in which the Individual is the centre. The same analysis showed that for the former the appropriate test of what is good and what is right i.e. the test of the moral order is utility while for the latter the test is justice. Now the reason why the philosophy of Hinduism does not answer the test either of utility or of justice is because the religious ideal of Hinduism for divine governance of human society is an ideal which falls into a separate class by itself. It is an ideal in which the individual is not the centre. The centre of the ideal is neither individual nor society. It is a class - the class of Supermen called Brahmins. Those who will bear the dominant and devastating fact in mind will understand why the philosophy of Hinduism is not founded on individual justice or social utility. The philosophy of Hinduism is founded on a totally different principle. To the question what is right and what is good the answer which the philosophy of Hinduism gives is remarkable. It holds that to be right and good the act must serve the interest of this class of supermen, namely, the Brahmins. Oscar Wilde said that to be intelligible is to be found out. Manu is neither afraid nor ashamed of being found out. Indeed Mañu does not leave it to be found out. He expresses his view in resonant and majestic notes as who are the Supermen and anything which serves the interest of the Supermen is alone entitled to be called right and good. Let me quote Manu.

X. 3. "On account of his pre-eminence, on account of the superiority of his origin, on account of his observance of (particular) restrictive rules, and on account of his particular sanctification the Brahman is the Lord of (all) Varnas."

He proceeds to amplify his reasons and does so in the following characteristic manner:—

I. 93. "As the Brahmana sprang from (Prajapati's i.e. Gods) mouth, as he was first-born, and as he possesses the Veda, he is by right the lord of this whole creation."

I. 94. For the self existent (Svayambhu i.e. God), having performed austerities, produced him first from his own mouth, in order that offerings might be conveyed to the Gods and Manes and that this universe might be preserved."

I. 95. "What created being can surpass him, through whose mouth the gods continually consume the sacrificial viands and the manes the offerings to the dead?"

I. 96. "Of created beings the most excellent are said to be those which are animated; of the animated, those who subsist by intelligence; of the intelligent, mankind; and of the men, the Brahmanas".

Besides the reason given by Manu the Brahmin is first in rank because he was produced by God from his mouth, in order that the offerings might be conveyed to the Gods and manes. Manu gives another reason for the supremacy of the Brahmins. He says:—

I. 98. "The very birth of a Brahmana is an eternal incarnation of the sacred Law (Veda); for he is born to (fulfil) the sacred law, and becomes one with Brahman (God)."

I. 99. "A Brahmana, coming into existence, is born as the highest on earth, the lord of all created beings, for the protection of the treasury of the Law."

Manu concludes by saying that:—

I. 101. "The Brahman eats but his own food, wears but his own apparel, bestows but his own in alms; other mortals subsist through the benevolence of the Brahmana."

Because according to Manu:—

II. 100. "Whatever exists in the world is the property of the Brahmana; on account of the excellence of his origin the Brahmana is, indeed, entitled to it all."

Manu directs:—

VII. 36. "Let the King, after rising early in the morning, worship Brahmans who are well versed in the three-fold sacred science and learned (in polity), and follow their advice".

VII. 38. "Let him daily worship aged Brahmans who know the Veda and are pure....."

VII. 37. "Let the king, having risen at early dawn, respectfully attend to Brahman, learned in the three Vedas and in the science of ethics, and by their decision let him abide."

VII. 38. "Constantly must he show respect to Brahmans, who have grown old, both in years and in piety, who know the scriptures, who in body and mind are pure; for he, who honours the aged, will perpetually be honoured even by cruel demons."

IX. 313. "Let him not, although in the greatest distress for money, provoke Brahmans to anger by taking their property; for they, once enraged, could immediately by sacrifices and imprecations destroy him with his troops, elephants, horses and cars."

Finally Manu says:—

XI. 35. “The Brahman is (hereby) declared (to be) the creator (of the world), the punisher, the teacher, (and hence) a benefactor (of all created beings); to him let no man say anything unpropitious; nor use any harsh words”.

To conclude and complete the theory of supermen and of what is right and good let me reproduce the following two texts from Manu:—

X. 122. But let a Shudra serve Brahmans, either for the sake of heaven or with a view to both this life and the next, for he who is called the servant of a Brahman thereby gains all his ends.

X. 123. The service of the Brahmana alone is declared to be an excellent occupation for a Shudra; for whatever else besides this he may perform will bear no fruit.

And Manu adds:—

X. 129. No collection of wealth must be made by a Shudra, even though he be able to do it; for a Shudra who has acquired wealth gives pain to Brahman.

The above texts from Manu disclose the core and the heart of the philosophy of Hinduism. Hinduism is the gospel of the superman and it teaches that what is right for the superman is the only thing which is called morally right and morally good.

Is there any parallel to this philosophy? I hate to suggest it. But it is so obvious. The parallel to this philosophy of Hinduism is to be found in Nietzsche. The Hindus will be angry at this suggestion. It is quite natural. For the philosophy of Nietzsche stands in great odium. It never took roots. In his own words he was “sometimes deified as the philosopher of the aristocracy and squirearchy, sometimes hooted at, sometimes pitied and sometimes boycotted as an inhuman being”. Nietzsche’s philosophy had become identified with will to power, violence, denial of spiritual values, superman and the sacrifice, servility and debasement of the common man. His philosophy with these high spots had created a certain loathsomeness and horror in the minds of the people of his own generation. He was utterly neglected if not shunned and Nietzsche himself took comfort by placing himself among the “posthumous men”. He foresaw for himself a remote public, centuries after his own time to appreciate him. Here too Nietzsche was destined to be disappointed. Instead of there being any appreciation of his philosophy, the lapse of time has only augmented the horror and loathing which people of his generation felt for Nietzsche. This is principally due to the revelation that the philosophy of Nietzsche is capable of producing Nazism. His friends have vehemently protested

against such a construction.<sup>1</sup> But it is not difficult to see that his philosophy can be as easily applied to evolve a super state as to superman. This is what the Nazis have done. At any rate the Nazis trace their ancestry from Nietzsche and regard him as their spiritual parent. Hitler has himself photographed beside a bust of Nietzsche; he takes the manuscripts of the master under his own special guardianship; extracts are chosen from Nietzsche's writings and loudly proclaimed at the ceremonies of Nazism, as the New German Faith. Nor is the claim by the Nazis of spiritual ancestry with Nietzsche denied by his near relations. Nietzsche's own cousin Richard Ochler approvingly says that Nietzsche's thought is Hitler in action and that Nietzsche was the foremost pioneer of the Nazi accession to power. Nietzsche's own sister, few months before her death, thanks the Feurhar for the honour he graciously bestows on her brother declaring that she sees in him that incarnation of the "Superman" foretold by Zarathustra.

To identify Nietzsche, whose name and whose philosophy excites so much horror and so much loathing; with Manu is sure to cause astonishment and resentment in the mind of the Hindus. But of the fact itself there can be no doubt. Nietzsche himself has openly declared that in his philosophy he is only following the scheme of Manu. In his *Anti Christ* this is what Nietzsche says:—

"After all, the question is, to what end are falsehoods perpetrated? The fact that, in Christianity, 'holy' ends are entirely absent, constitutes my objection to the means it employs. Its ends are only bad ends; the poisoning, the calumny and the denial of life, the contempt of the body, the degradation and self pollution of man by virtue of the concept of sin, - consequently its means are bad as well. My feelings are quite the reverse, When I read the law book of Manu, an incomparably intellectual and superior work, it would be a sin against the spirit even to mention in the same breath with the Bible. You will guess immediately why; it has a genuine philosophy behind it, in it, not merely an evil-smelling Jewish distillation of Rabbinitism and superstition - it gives something to chew even to the most fastidious psychologist. And, not to forget the most important point of all, it is fundamentally different from every kind of Bible: by means of it the noble classes, the philosophers and the warriors guard and guide the masses; it is replete with noble values, it is filled with a feeling of perfection, with saying yea to life, and triumphant sense of well-being in regard to itself and to life, - the Sun shines upon the whole book. All those

<sup>1</sup> For this as also for facts which follow see M.P.Nicolas, "From Nietzsche Down to Hitler" 1938.

things which Christianity smothers with its bottomless vulgarity; procreation, woman, marriage, are here treated with earnestness, with reverence, with love and confidence. How can one possibly place in the hands of children and women, a book that contains those vile words: "to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. . . . it is better to marry than to burn". And is it decent to be a Christian so long as the very origin of man is Christianised, - that is to say, befouled, by the idea of the immaculate conception?... I know of no book in which so many delicate and kindly things are said to woman, as in the Law Book of Manu; these old grey-beards and saints have a manner of being gallant to woman which, perhaps, cannot be surpassed. "The mouth of a woman", says Manu on one occasion, "the breast of a maiden, the prayer of a child, and the smoke of the sacrifice, are always pure". Elsewhere he says: "there is nothing purer than the light of the Sun, the shadow cast by a cow, air water, fire and the breath of a Maiden". And finally-perhaps this is also a holy lie:— "all the openings of the body above the navel are pure, all those below the navel are impure. Only in a maiden is the whole body pure."

This leaves no doubt that Zarathustra is a new name for Manu and that *Thus Spake Zarathustra* is a new edition of *Manu Smriti*.

If there is any difference between Manu and Nietzsche it lies in this. Nietzsche was genuinely interested in creating a new race of men which will be a race of supermen as compared with the existing race of men. Manu on the other hand was interested in maintaining the privileges of a class who had come to arrogate to itself the claim of being supermen. Nietzsche's supermen were supermen by reason of their worth. Manu's supermen were supermen by reason of their birth. Nietzsche was a genuine disinterested philosopher. Manu on the contrary was an hireling engaged to propound a philosophy which served the interests of a class born in a group and whose title to being supermen was not to be lost even if they lost their virtue. Compare the following texts from Manu.

X. 81. "Yet a Brahman, unable to subsist by his duties just mentioned, may live by the duty of a soldier; for that is the next rank."

X. 82. "If it be asked, how he must live, should he be unable to get a subsistence by either of those employments; the answer is, he may subsist as a mercantile man, applying himself into tillage and attendance on cattle."



Manu adds :

IX. 317. "A Brahmana, be he ignorant or learned, is a great divinity, just as the fire, whether carried forth (for the performance of a burnt oblation ) or not carried forth, is a great divinity".

IX.323. "Thus, though the Brahmans employ themselves in all (sorts) of mean occupation, they must be honoured in every way; (for each of) them is a very great diety".

Thus Manu's is a degraded and degenerate philosophy of superman as compared with that of Nietzsche and therefore far more odious and loathsome than the philosophy of Nietzsche.

This explains why the philosophy of Hinduism does not satisfy the test of justice or of utility. Hinduism is not interested in the common man. Hinduism is not interested in Society as a whole. The centre of its interest lies in a class and its philosophy is concerned in sustaining and supporting the rights of that class. That is why in the Philosophy of Hinduism the interests of the common man as well as of society are denied, suppressed and sacrificed to the interest of this class of Supermen.

What is the value of such a religion to man ?

Mr. Balfour in speaking on the merits of positivism as Religion asked the positivists certain questions which are worth recalling. He very pertinently asked ;

"What has (Positivism) to say to the more obscure multitude who are absorbed, and well nigh overwhelmed, in the constant struggle with daily needs and narrow cares; who have but little leisure or inclination to consider the precise role they are called on to play in the great drama of 'humanity' and who might in any case be puzzled to discover its interest or its importance? Can it assure them that there is no human being so insignificant as not to be of infinite worth in the eyes of Him who created the Heavens, or so feeble but that his action may have consequence of infinite moment long after this material system shall have crumbled into nothingness? Does it offer consolation to those who are bereaved, strength to the weak, forgiveness to the sinful, rest to those who are weary and heavy laden?"

The same questions may be asked of Manu.

The answer to each one of them must be in the affirmative.

In short the philosophy of Hinduism is such that it cannot be called the Religion of humanity. That is why to use the language of Balfour, Hinduism, if it penetrates, does not vitrify the inmost life of ordinary humanity. Indeed if it does anything it paralyses it. There is in Hinduism no nourishment for ordinary human souls, no comfort for ordinary human sorrow, no help for ordinary human weakness. It

leaves men in darkness face to face with the unthinking energies of nature which gives them birth to which after a few fruitless struggles they succumb. Not less cruel than the crudest irreligion, does it leave men divorced from all communion with God.

Such is the philosophy of Hinduism. It is Superman's heaven and the common man's damnation.

I am conscious that my position regarding the philosophy of Hinduism will be assailed from different sides. So contrary it is to the current views about it that it is bound to be assailed. The attack may come from various sides.

It will be said that I am wrong in taking the Manu Smriti as the book of Hindu religion and that the true gospel of Hinduism is contained in the Vedas and the Bhagwat Gita..

I am sure no orthodox Hindu will be bold enough to repudiate the authority of Manu Smriti as a book of Hindu Religion. Such a charge can be made only by some reformed sects of Hinduism such as the Arya Samajists. But there can be no doubt that this charge is not well founded. To refute this charge it is perhaps desirable to explain<sup>1</sup> how the Smritis obtained a place and position of authority among the Hindus.

The Smritis originally were a collection of rules relating to social traditions, customs and conventions approved of and recommended by those who were learned in the Vedas. For a long time these rules existed only in the memory of those learned in the Vedas, so they began to be called Smritis i.e. things which are remembered in contrast to Vedas or Shruti that is things which were heard. In the beginning the Smritis even when they were codified were treated as rules of inferior value as compared with the rules contained in the Vedas.

The difference in their authority and binding force was the result of the natural difference between the trustworthiness of what is heard as compared to what is only remembered. There was also another reason of this differentiation in the two sorts of Dharma Shastra literature. This was based upon the status of their authors. The authors of the Vedas were Rishis. The authors of the Smritis were only learned men. The Rishis were superior in status and sanctity than those who were merely learned. Consequently the Vedas were treated as more authoritative than the Smritis.

The consequence arising from this was well expressed in the Hindu theological formula according to which if there was a conflict in the rules of two Vedas on the same subject it meant option for a rule of

<sup>1</sup> See the interesting article by Prof. Altekar—on "The Position of Smritis as a Source of Dharma" in the Kane Memorial Volume pp. 18-25.

Vedas cannot be deemed to be inoperative. On the other hand, in a conflict between a rule of Shruti and a rule of Smriti the rule of Shruti prevailed because for the reasons stated above Smriti was inferior in authority to the Shruti. But as pointed out by Prof. Altekar, the Smritis in course of time came to be invested with the same authority as belonged to the Vedas. Various means were adopted to accomplish this purpose. In the first place the authors of the Smritis were elevated to the status of Rishis. The early Dharma Shashtra writers like Gautama, and Baudhayana were never given the status of a Rishi. But Manu and Yajnavalkya are reckoned as Rishis. By this means the status of the Smritis was equated to that of the Shrutis. The second means adopted was to regard the Smriti as the record from memory of a Shruti which was lost. Thus Smriti instead of being regarded as something quite different from Shruti came to be regarded as akin to and indistinguishable from Shruti. The result of these steps was a complete change in the rules regarding the authority of the two. Originally if there was a conflict between a Smriti and a Shruti, the Shruti prevailed. The new rule was that in case of conflict there was an option which meant that the Smriti rule was as operative as the Rule of Shruti. This new rule has been expressly laid down by Kumarila in his commentary on the Purvamimamsa Sutra whereby the Smritis were made as authoritative as Shrutis.

While originally Hindu Society was bound to the Vedas and could not follow any rule which was contrary to the Vedas, the new rule altered the situation and left it to the option of society either to follow the Shruti or the Smriti. But even this option was later on taken away. This was done by making the study of the Smritis as compulsory as that of the Shruti.

This was done gradually. In the first place it was suggested that the Shrutis and Smritis are the two eyes of the Brahamana, if he is devoid of one he becomes a one-eyed person. Then came the theory that Brahmanyam is possible only as the result of a joint study of both the Vedas and the Smritis. Finally came the rule according to which the study of the Smriti only was recognized and a contempt of the Smriti was made a sin and a person guilty of it was declared to be condemned to be born as a beast for 21 generations.

This is how the Smritis have been recognized as a source of Hindu Religion and there is no doubt that, to quote Prof. Altekar, the Smritis;

“have played a great part in determining the features of many a social and socio-religious institutions and customs and in moulding the development of modern Hinduism.”

It cannot therefore be maintained that I was wrong in taking Manu Smriti as containing the philosophy of Hinduism.

This work of elevating the Smritis to the status of the Vedas was undertaken by the Brahmins for a most selfish reason. The Smritis contain in all its wild and luxurious growth the doctrine of Caste, the doctrine of the superiority of the Brahmins, their rights and privileges, the doctrine of the subordination of the Kshatriyas and Vaishyas and the doctrine of the degradation of the Shudras. Such being the philosophy of the Smritis, the Brahmins were directly interested in investing the Smritis with the authority which was claimed for the Vedas and in which they ultimately succeeded to their advantage but to the ruination of the whole country. But conceding—which orthodox and pious Hindu would do—that the Smritis do not contain the philosophy of Hinduism but that the same is to be found in the Vedas and the Bhagwat Geeta the question is what difference would this make in the result.

It seems to me that it matters very little whether one takes the Smritis, or the Vedas or the Bhagwat Geeta.

Do the Vedas teach something which is fundamentally different from what the Smritis do? Does the Bhagwat Geeta run contrary to the injunctions of the Smritis. A few illustrations will make the matter clear.

It is indisputable that the Vedas lay down the theory of Chaturvarna in what is known as the Purushasukta. This Purushasukta recognizes two basic principles. It recognizes the division of society into four sections as an ideal. It also recognizes that the ideal relationship between the four sections is inequality.

What the Bhagwat Geeta teaches is also beyond controversy. Its teaching may be summarized in the following four pronouncements made by Krishna in the Bhagwat Geeta.

(1) "I myself have created the arrangement known as Chaturvarna (i.e. the fourfold division of society into four castes Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras) assigning them different occupations in accordance with the native capacities. It is I who am the maker of this Chaturvarna"—Gita. IV. 13

(2) "Even if it may be easier to follow the occupation of another *Varna* yet to follow the occupation of one's own *Varna* is more meritorious, although one may not be able to do it quite efficiently. There is bliss in following the occupation of one's own *Varna*, even if death were to result in performing it; but to follow the occupation of another *Varna* is risky".—Geeta. III. 35.

(3) "The educated should not unsettle the faith of the uneducated who have become attached to their occupation. He himself should perform the occupation of his Varna and make others perform their's accordingly. An educated man may not become attached to his occupation. But the uneducated and dull-minded people who have become attached to their occupation should not be spoiled by the educated by putting them on a wrong path by abandoning their own occupation"—Geeta III. 26, 29.

(4) "Oh, Arjun! Whenever this religion of duties and occupations (i.e. this religion of Chaturvarna) declines, then I myself will come to birth to punish those who are responsible for its downfall and to restore it—Geeta IV, 7-8.

Such is the position of Geeta. What difference is there between it and the Manu Smriti? Geeta is Manu in a nutshell. Those who run away from Manu Smriti and want to take refuge in Geeta either do not know Gita or are prepared to omit from their consideration that soul of Geeta which makes it akin to Manu Smriti.

Compare the teachings of the Veda, of the Bhagwat Geeta with what is contained in the Manu Smriti which I have taken as the text for elucidating the philosophy of Hinduism. What difference does one find? The only difference one can find is that the Vedas and the Bhagwat Geeta deal with General Theory while the Smritis are concerned in working out the particulars and details of that theory. But so far as the essence is concerned all of them—the Smritis, the Vedas and the Bhagwat Geeta—are woven on the same pattern, the same thread runs through them and are really parts of the same fabric.

The reason for this is obvious. The Brahmins who were the authors of the whole body of Hindu Religious Literature—except the Upanishad Literature—took good care to inject the doctrines formulated by them in the Smritis, into the Vedas and the Bhagwat Geeta. Nothing is to be gained in picking and chosing between them. The Philosophy of Hinduism will be the same whether one takes the Manu Smriti as its Gospel or whether one takes the Vedas and the Bhagwat Geeta as the gospel of Hinduism.

Secondly it will be contended that Manu Smriti is a Book of Laws and not a code of ethics and that what I have presented as a philosophy of Hinduism is only legal philosophy and is not the moral philosophy of Hinduism.

My answer to this contention is simple. I hold that in Hinduism there is no distinction between legal philosophy and moral philosophy. That is because in Hinduism there is no distinction between the Legal and the Moral, the Legal being also the Moral.

Not much evidence is necessary to support my contention. Take the meaning<sup>1</sup> of the word Dharma in the Rig Veda. The word Dharma occurs in the Rig Veda 58 times. It is used in six different senses. It is used to denote (1) Ancient custom, (2) Laws, (3) Any arrangement which maintains law and order in society, (4) The course of nature, (5) The quality of a substance and (6) Duty of good and evil. It will thus be seen that from the very beginning the word Dharma in Hinduism has a two fold connotation. It means both law and moral. That is one reason why in the philosophy of Hinduism there can be no distinction between legal philosophy and moral philosophy.

This is not to say that the Hindus have no code of morality. To be sure they have. But it is very pertinent to ask the nature and character of conduct which the Hindu Code of Ethics declares to be moral.

To have an idea of the nature of conduct which the Hindu thinks moral, it is better to begin by recognizing that there are three levels of conduct<sup>2</sup> which must be distinguished. (1) Conduct arising from instincts and fundamental needs (2) Conduct regulated by standards of society and (3) Conduct regulated by individual conscience. Conduct on the first level, we do not call moral conduct. It is of course not immoral; it is merely unmoral. It is governed by forces not as moral in purpose but as valuable in result. The forces are biological or sociological or psychological. These have purpose, such as to satisfy hunger, or to forge a weapon against an enemy. But the end is one set up by our physical or instinctive nature. So long as this is merely *accepted* as an inevitable end and not compared with others, valued, and *chosen*, it is not properly moral. Conduct on the second level is no doubt social. Wherever groups of men are living there are certain ways of acting which are common to the group—"folkways". There are *approved* ways of acting, common to a group, and handed down from generation to generation. Such approved ways of acting are called the mores or the morals of the group. They imply the judgment of the group that they are to be followed. The welfare of the group is regarded as in some sense imbedded in them. It becomes the duty of the individual to follow them and if any one acts contrary to them he is made to feel the group's disapproval. We cannot strictly speaking call the conduct moral. Because the end is *accepted* as a standard of 'good' prescribed by society. If it had spoken of a moral conduct it is only because it conforms to the mores or morals of the Society. It may be called customary morality. Conduct on the third level is conduct which alone is truly and completely moral. That is because in it the

<sup>1</sup> What follows is taken from an article on the subject by Mr. Yeshwant Ramkrishna Date in a Marathi Magazine called "Swadhaya" Double No. 7-8. First year pp. 18-21.

<sup>2</sup> In this I am entirely following the analysis given by Crawley and Tufts in their volume on Ethics.

individual *recognizes* the right or *chooses* the good, and freely devotes himself heartily to its fulfilment. He does not merely accept what is inevitable or follow what is approved by society. He values and chooses the end and becomes personally responsible. His is reflective morality.

On what level does Hindu morality stand? Obviously it is not on the third level. This means that a Hindu is social but not moral in the strict sense of the term. A Hindu takes no responsibility for the ends he serves. He is a willing tool in the hands of his society, content to follow. He is not a free agent not afraid to differ. His notions of sin give remarkable proof of his unmoral character. Institutes of Vishnu gives a list of sins which are divided into nine classes:—

1. Deadly sins—*atipataka*. These are certain forms of incest, to be atoned for only by burning.

2. Great sins—*mahapataka*. These are killing a Brahman, drinking spirituous liquor, stealing the gold of a Brahman, connexion with a Guru's wife; also social intercourse with those guilty of such sins.

3. Minor sins of a similar character—*anupataka*. These include the killing of certain other classes of persons, giving false evidence and killing a friend, stealing lands or deposits of a Brahman, certain forms of incest and adultery.

4. Minor sins—*upapataka*. Sins of false statement, neglect of certain religious duties, adultery, unlawful occupation, offences connected with marrying before an elder brother &c., not paying one's debts to the Gods, and manes, atheism &c.

5. Sins effecting loss of caste—*jatibramsakara*. Causing bodily pain to a Brahman, smelling things which should not be smelt, dishonest dealing, certain unnatural crimes.

6. Sins which degrade to a mixed caste—*samkarikarana*. Killing domestic or wild animals.

7. Sins which render one unworthy to receive alms—*apatrikarana*. Receiving presents and alms from despicable persons, trade, money—lending, lying, serving a Shudra.

8. Sins causing defilment—*malavaha*. Killing birds, amphibious animals, and aquatic animals, worms and insects; eating nutmegs or other plants similar in their effects to intoxicating liquors.

9. Miscellaneous sins—*prakirnaka*. Those not already mentioned.

This list of sins is not exhaustive but it is long enough and illustrative enough to give us the idea which underlies the Hindu notion of Sin. In the first place it connotes the fall of man from a prescribed form of conduct. In the second place it means to be defiled, to become unclean. This is the root meaning of the term *Patak*. It

means *Patana* (falling away) and it means *Asowcha* (being rendered unclean). In either case sin according to Hindu notion is a disease of the soul. In the first sense it is merely breach of a rule of external conduct. In the other sense it is a defilement of the body to be cleaned and purified by both or by pilgrimage or by sacrificial offering. But it is never the spiritual defilement which is associated with the harbouring of evil thoughts and purposes.

This shows the morality of the Hindu is purely social. This means that the level of his morality is purely traditional and customary. There are two evils of customary morality. In the first place there is no surety that it will always be charged with sincerity and purity of motive. For it is only when morality penetrates to the deepest springs of purpose and feeling in the individual that pretense will cease to find a place in human behaviour. In the second place customary morality is an anchor and a drag. It holds up the average man and holds back the man who forges ahead. Customary morality is only another name for moral stagnation. This is true of all cases where morality is only customary morality. But the customary morality of the Hindus has an evil feature which is peculiar to it. Customary morality is a matter of meritorious conduct. Ordinarily this meritorious conduct is something which is good from the general or public point of view. But among the Hinduism the meritorious conduct is not concerned with the worship of God or the general good of community. Meritorious conduct in Hinduism is concerned with the giving of presents, of good and of honour to the Brahmins. Hindu Ethics is worship of the superman.

What difference would it have made if I had taken Hindu Ethics as the basis for deducing the philosophy of Hinduism? Most students of Hinduism forget that just as in Hinduism there is no difference between law and Religion so there is no difference between law and ethics. Both are concerned with the same thing namely regulating the conduct of the low class Hindus to *subserve* the ends of high Caste Hindus.

Thirdly it will be objected that I presented an altogether false picture of Hinduism in as much as I have omitted to take into account the Upanishads which are the true source of Hindu philosophy.

I admit that I have not taken the Upanishads into account. But I have a reason and I believe very good reason for doing so. I am concerned with the philosophy of Hinduism as a part of the philosophy of Religion. I am not concerned with Hindu philosophy. If I was, it would have been necessary to examine the Upanishads. But I am quite willing to deal with it so as to leave no doubt that what I have shown to be the philosophy of Hinduism is the philosophy of Upanishads.



The philosophy of the Upanishads can be stated in very few words. It has been well summarized by Huxley<sup>1</sup> when he says that the Upanishad philosophy agreed:—

“In supposing the existence of a permanent reality, or ‘substance’, beneath the shifting series of phenomena, whether of matter or of mind. The substance of the cosmos was ‘Brahma’, that of the individual man ‘Atman’; and the latter was separated from the former only, if I may so speak, by its phenomenal envelope, by the casing of sensations, thoughts and desires, pleasures and pains, which make up the illusive phantasmagoria of life. This the ignorant, take for reality; their ‘Atman’ therefore remains eternally imprisoned in delusions, bound by the fetters of desire and scourged by the whip of misery.

Of what use is this philosophy of the Upanishadas ? The philosophy of the Upanishadas meant withdrawal from the struggle for existence by resort to asceticism and a destruction of desire by self mortification. As a way of life it was condemned by Huxley<sup>2</sup> in scathing terms:—

“No more thorough mortification of the flesh has ever been attempted than that achieved by the Indian ascetic anchorite; no later monachism has so nearly succeeded in reducing the human mind to that condition of impassive quasi-somnambulism, which, but for its acknowledged holiness, might run the risk of being confounded with idiocy.”

But the condemnation of the philosophy of the Upanishads is nothing as compared to the denunciation of the same by Lala Hardy<sup>3</sup>:—

“The Upanishads claim to expound ‘that, by knowing which everything is known’. This quest for ‘the absolute’ is the basis of all the spurious metaphysics of India. The treatises are full of absurd conceits, quaint fancies, and chaotic speculations. And we have not learned that they are worthless. We keep moving in the old rut; we edit and re-edit the old books instead of translating the classics of European social thought. What could Europe be if Frederic Harrison, Brioux, Bebel, Anatole France, Herve, Haeckel, Giddings, and Marshall should employ their time in composing treatises on Duns, Scotus and Thomas Aquinas, and discussing the merits of the laws of the Pentateuch and the poetry of Beowulf ? Indian pundits and graduates seem to suffer from a kind of mania for what is effete and antiquated. Thus an institution, established by progressive men, aims at leading our youths through Sanskrit grammar to the Vadas

<sup>1</sup> Evolution and Ethics. p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> Evolution and Ethics. p. 64

<sup>3</sup> Modern Review, July, 1912.

via the Six Darshanas ! What a false move in the quest for wisdom ! It is as if a caravan should travel across the desert to the shores of the Dead Sea in search of fresh water ! Young men of India, look not for wisdom in the musty parchments of your metaphysical treatises. There is nothing but an endless round of verbal jugglery there. Read Rousseau and Voltaire, Plato and Aristotle, Haeckel and Spencer, Marx and Tolstoi, Ruskin and Comte, and other European thinkers, if you wish to understand life and its problems."

But denunciations apart, did the Upanishad philosophy have any influence on Hinduism as a social and political system ? There is no doubt that it turned out to be most ineffective and inconsequential piece of speculation with no effect on the moral and social order of the Hindus.

It may not be out of place to inquire into the reasons for this unfortunate result. One reason is obvious. The philosophy of Upanishad remained incomplete and therefore did not yield the fruit which it ought to have done. This will be quite clear if one asks what is the key-note of the Upanishads. In the words of Prof. Max Muller<sup>1</sup> the key note of the Upanishads is 'Know thy Self'. The 'Know thy Self' of the Upanishads, means, know thy true Self, that which underlies thine ego and find it and know it in the highest, the eternal self, the One without a Second, which underlies the whole world."

That Atman and Brahman were one was the truth, the great truth which the Upanishads said they had discovered and they asked man to know this truth. Now the reasons why the philosophy of Upanishads, became ineffective are many. I will discuss them elsewhere. At this place I will mention only one. The philosophers of Upanishads did not realize that to know truth was not enough. One must learn to love truth. The difference between philosophy and religion may be put in two ways. Philosophy is concerned with knowing truth. Religion is concerned with the love of truth. Philosophy is static. Religion is dynamic. These differences are merely two aspects of one and the same thing. Philosophy is static because it is concerned only with knowing truth. Religion is dynamic because it is concerned with love of truth. As has been well said by Max Plowman<sup>2</sup>:—

"... Unless religion is dynamic and begets in us the emotion of love for something, then it is better to be without any thing that we can call religion; for religion is perception of truth and if our perception of truth is not accompanied by our love for it then it were better not seen at all; The Devil himself is one who has seen

<sup>1</sup> Hibbert lectures 1878, p. 317.

<sup>2</sup> "The Nemesis of Ineffectual Religion"—Adelphi, January 1941.

the truth only to hate it. Tennyson said "We must love the highest when we see it". It does not follow. Seen in pure objectivity the highest repels by its difference and distance; what we fear it, and what we fear we come to hate....."

This is the fate of all transcendental philosophies. They have no influence on the way of life. As Blake said "Religion is politics and politics is Brotherhood. Philosophy must become Religion that is it must become a Working Ethic. It must not remain mere metaphysics. As Mr. Plowman says—

"If religion were a Metaphysic and nothing else, one thing is certain, it would never be the concern of the simple and humble men.

"To keep it wholly in the realm of Metaphysic is to make nonsense of it. For belief in religion as in something not directly and vitally effective of politics is ultimately belief that is strictly speaking idiotic; because in the effective sense such a belief makes no difference, and in the world of time and space what 'makes no difference' does not exist."

It is for these very reasons that the philosophy of the Upanishads proved so ineffective.

It is therefore incontrovertible that notwithstanding the Hindu Code of Ethics, notwithstanding the philosophy of the Upanishads not a title not a jot did abate from the philosophy of Hinduism as propounded by Manu. They were ineffective and powerless to erase the infamy preached by Manu in the name of religion. Notwithstanding their existence one can still say

"Hinduism! Thy name is inequality!"

## V

Inequality is the soul of Hinduism. The morality of Hinduism is only social. It is unmoral and unhuman to say the least. What is unmoral and unhuman easily becomes immoral, inhuman and infamous. This is what Hinduism has become. Those who doubt this or deny this proposition should examine the social composition of the Hindu society and ponder over the condition of some of the elements in it. Take the following cases.

First as to the Primitive Tribes. In what state of civilization are they?

The history of human civilization includes the entire period of human progress from Savagery to Barbarism and from Barbarism to civilization. The transition from one to other has been marked by

some discovery or intention in some department of knowledge of Art resulting in advancing the onward march of man.

The development of articulate speech was the first thing which, from the point of view of human progress, divided man from the brute. It marks the first stage of savagery. The Middle period of the state of savagery began with the knowledge of the manufacture and use of fire. This wonderful discovery enabled man to extend his habit almost indefinitely. He could leave his forest home, go to different and colder climates, and increase his food supply by including flesh and fish. The next discovery was the Bow and Arrow. This was the greatest achievement of primitive man and marks the highest state of savage man. It was indeed a wonderful implement. The possessor of this device could bring down the fleetest animal and could defend himself against the most predatory.

The transition from Savagery to Barbarism was marked by the discovery of pottery. Hitherto man had no utensils that could withstand the action of fire. Without utensils man could not store nor could he cook. Undoubtedly pottery was a great civilizing influence.

The Middle state of Barbarism began when man learned to domesticate wild animals. Man learned that captive animals could be of service to him. Man now became a herdsman, no longer dependent for food upon the precarious chase of wild animals. Milk procurable at all seasons made a highly important addition to his dietary. With the aid of horse and camel he traversed wide areas hitherto impassable. The captive animals became aids to commerce which resulted in the dissemination of commodities as well as of ideas.

The next discovery was of the Art of smelting iron. This marks the highest stage of advancement of Barbaric man. With this discovery man became a "tool-making animal" who with his tool could fashion wood and stone and build houses and bridges.

This marks the close of the advancement made by Barbaric man.

The dividing line which marks off Barbaric people from Civilized people, in the fullest sense of the word Civilization, is the art of making ideas tangible by means of graphic signs—which is called the art of writing. With this man conquered time as he had with the earlier inventions conquered space. He could now record his deeds and his thoughts. Henceforth, his knowledge, his poetical dreams, his moral aspirations might be recorded in such form as to be read not merely by his contemporaries but by successive generations of remote posterity. For man his history became safe and secure. This was the steepest ascent and the climbing of it marks the beginnings of civilization.

Stopping here for the moment let us ask in what state of civilization are the Primitive Tribes.

The name Primitive Tribes<sup>1</sup> is expressive of the present state of people who are called by that name. They live in small scattered huts in forests. They live on wild fruits, nuts and roots. Fishing and hunting are also resorted to for the purpose of securing food. Agriculture plays a very small part in their social economy. Food supplies being extremely precarious, they lead a life of semi-starvation from which there is no escape. As to clothes they economize them to a vanishing point. They move almost in a state of complete nakedness. There is a tribe which is known as "Bonda Porajas" which means "Naked Porajas". Of these people it is said that the women wear a very narrow strip which serves as a petticoat almost identical with what is worn by the Momjak Nagas in Assam, the ends hardly meeting at the top on the left thigh. These petticoats are woven at home out of the fibre of a forest tree. Girls wear a fillet of beads and of palmyra leaf and an enormous quantity of beads and neck ornaments extremely like those worn by many Komjak women. Otherwise the women wear nothing. The women shave their heads entirely. . . . . Of these Chenchus, a tribe residing near Farhabad in the Nizam's Dominions it is said that "their houses are conical, rather slight in structure made of bamboos sloping to the central point and covered with a thinnish layer of thatch. . . . . They have very little, indeed, in the way of material effects, the scanty clothes they wear, consisting of a *langoti* and a cloth in the case of men, and a short bodice and a petticoat in the case of women, being practically all, besides a few cooking pots and a basket or two which perhaps sometimes contains grain. They keep cattle and goats and in this particular village do a little cultivation, elsewhere subsisting on honey and forest produce which they sell". Regarding the Morias, another Primitive tribe, it is stated the men generally wear a single cloth round the waist with a slap coming down in the front. They also have a necklace of beads and when they dance put on cock's plumes and peacock's feathers in their turbans. Many girls are profusely tattooed, especially on their faces, and some of them on their legs as well. The type of tattooing is said to be according to the taste of the individual and it is done with thorns and needles. In their hair many of them stick the feathers of jungle cocks and their heads are also adorned with combs of wood and tin and brass.

These Primitive Tribes have no hesitation about eating anything, even worms and insects, and, in fact, there is very little meat that they will

<sup>1</sup> This and other information is taken from Census of India 1931 Vol. I part

not eat, whether the animal has died a natural death or has been killed four days or more before by a tiger.

The next group of the people he will come accross are the Criminal Tribes.

The Criminal Tribes live not in Forests as the Primitive Tribes do but in the plains in close proximity to, and often in the midst of civilized life. Hollius in his "Criminal Tribes of the United Provinces" gives an account of their activities. They live entirely by crime. A few may be ostensibly engaged in agriculture, but this is only to cover up their real activities. Their nefarious practices find largest scope in dacoity or robbery by violence, but being a community organized for crime, nothing comes amiss to them. On deciding to commit a dacoity in any particular locality spies are sent out to select a suitable victim, study the general habits of the villagers, and the distance from any effective aid, and ennumerate the number of men and firearms. The raid usually takes place at midnight. Acting on the information given by the spies, men are posted at various points in the village and by firing off their guns attract attention from the main gang which attacks the particular house or houses previously appointed. The gang usually consists of 30 to 40 men.

It is essential to emphasize the great part played by crime in the general life of these peoples. A boy is initiated into crime as soon as he is able to walk and talk. No doubt the motive is practical, to a great extent, in so far as it is always better to risk a child in petty theft, who, if he is caught, would probably be cuffed, while an adult would immediately be arrested. An important part is also played by women, who, although they do not participate in the actual raids, have many heavy responsibilities. Besides being clever in disposing off stolen property the women of the Criminal Tribes are experts in shop lifting.

At one time the Criminal Tribes included such well organized Confederacies of Professional Criminals as the Pindharies and the Thugs.

The Pindharies were a predatory body of armed gangsters. Their organization was an open military organization of freebooters who could muster 20000 fine horse and even more. They were under the command of brigand chiefs. Chitu one of the most powerful commanders had under his single command 10000 horse, including 5000 good cavalry, besides infantry and guns. The Pindharies had no military projects for employing their loose bands of irregular soldiery, which developed into bodies of professional plunderers. The Pindharies aimed at no conquests. Their object was to secure booty and cash for themselves. General loot and rapine was their occupation.

They recognized no rulers. They were subjects of none. They rendered loyalty to none. They respected none, and plundered all, high and low, rich and poor, without fear or compunction.

The Thugs<sup>1</sup> were a well organized body of professional assassins, who, in gangs of from 10 to 100 wandered in various guises throughout India, worked themselves into the confidence of wayfarers of the wealthier class, and, when a favourable opportunity occurred, strangled them by throwing a handkerchief or noose round their necks, and then plundered and buried them. All this was done according to certain ancient and rigidly prescribed forms and after the performance of special religious rites, in which was the consecration of the package, and the sacrifice of sugar. They were staunch worshippers of Kali, the Hindu Goddess of destruction. Assassination for gain was with them a religious duty, and was considered a holy and honourable profession. They had, in fact, no idea of doing wrong, and their moral feelings did not come into play. The will of the Goddess, by whose command and in whose honour they followed their calling, was revealed to them through a very complicated system of omens. In obedience to these they often travelled even the distance of hundred miles in company with, or in the wake of, their intended victims before a safe opportunity had presented itself for executing their design; and when the deed was done, rites were performed in honour of that tutelary deity, and a goodly portion of the spoil was set apart for her. The Thugs had also a jargon of their own, as well as certain signs by which its members recognized each other in the remotest part of India. Even those who from age or infirmities could no longer take an active part in the operations, used to aid the cause as watchmen, spies or dressers of food. It was owing to their thorough organization, the secrecy and security with which they went to work, but chiefly to the religious garb in which they shrouded their murders, that they could continue for centuries to practise their craft. The extraordinary fact was that Thuggee was regarded as a regular profession by Indian Rulers of the day, both Hindu and Mahomedans. The Thugs paid taxes to the state and the state left them unmolested.

It was not until the British became rulers of the country that an attempt was made to suppress the Thugs. By 1835, 382 Thugs were hanged and 986 were transported or imprisoned for life. Even as late as 1879 the number of registered Thugs was 344 and the Thuggee and the Dacoity department of the Government of India continued to exist until 1904 when its place was taken by the Central Criminal Intelligence Department. While it is not possible for the criminal

<sup>1</sup> Encyclopedia Britannica. 11th Ed. Vol. XXVI p. 896.

tribes to live by organized bodies of criminals, crime continues to be their main occupation.

Besides these two classes there is a third class which comprizes a body of people who are known as Untouchables.

Below the Untouchables there are others who are known as Unapproachables. Untouchables are those who cause pollution only if they touch. The Unapproachables are those who cause pollution if they come within a certain distance. It is said of the Nayadis—a people who fall into the category of the Unapproachables, “that they are the lowest caste among the Hindus—the dog-eaters. They are the most persistent in their clamour for charity, and will follow at a respectful distance, for miles together any person walking, driving or boating. If any thing is given to them, it must be laid down, and after the person offering it has proceeded a sufficient distance, the receipient comes timidly forward, and removes it.” Of the same people Mr. Thurston says, “The subject (i.e. the Nayadis) whom I examined and measured at Shoranus, though living only about three miles off, had, by reason of the pollution which they traditionally carry with them to avoid walking over the long bridge which spans the river, and follow a circuitous route of many miles”.

Below the Unapproachables are the Unseeables.

In the Tinnevelley District of the Madras Presidency there is a class of unseeables called Purada Vannans. Of them it is said, “that they are not allowed to come out during day time because their sight is enough to cause pollution. These unfortunate people are ‘compelled’ to follow the nocturnal habits, leaving their dens after dark and scuttling home at the false dawn like the badger, the hyena, the avordvark.”

Consider the total population of these classes. The Primitive Tribes form a total of 25 million souls. The Criminal Tribes number  $4\frac{1}{2}$  millions and the Untouchables number 50 millions. This makes a grand total of  $79\frac{1}{2}$  millions. Now ask how these people could have remained in the state of moral, material, social and spiritual degradation surrounded as they have been by Hinduism. Hindus say that their civilization is older than any civilization, that Hinduism as a religion is superior to any other religion. If this is so how is that Hinduism failed to elevate these people, bring them enlightenment and hope; how is it that it failed even to reclaim them; how is it that it stood with folded hands when millions and millions were taking to life to shame and crime? What is the answer to this. The only answer is that Hinduism is overwhelmed with the fear of pollution. It has not got the power to purify. It has not the impulse to serve and that is because by its very nature it is unhuman and unmoral. It is a misnomer to call it religion. Its philosophy is opposed to very thing for which religion stands.



## Part II

---

### India and The Pre-requisites of Communism

*We are reproducing here the text of Chapter One and Two of 'The Hindu Social Order'. This Chapter seems to be a part of the book entitled 'India and Communism'. From the contents on the first page of the typed script, we find that Dr. Ambedkar had divided the whole book "India and Communism" into three parts. The first part was captioned as 'The Pre-requisites of Communism'. This part was to have three Chapters but we could not find any of these Chapters in Dr. Ambedkar's papers. So far as the part Two is concerned which is titled "India and the Pre-requisites of Communism", only Chapter Four entitled, "Hindu Social Order" has been found in a well bound register. This Chapter has two sub-titles as follows :—*

*I—Hindu Social Order: Its Essential Principles, and II—The Hindu Social Order: Its Unique Features. No other chapters on the subjects mentioned in the table of contents of this book were found. In all, there are 63 foolscap typed pages.—Editors.*



## CHAPTER 2

### The Hindu Social Order : Its Essential Principles

#### I

What is the character of the Hindu Social Order? Is it a free social order? To answer this question, some idea of what constitutes a free social order is necessary. Fortunately, the matter is not one of controversy. Since the days of the French Revolution there is no difference as to the essentials of a free social order. There may be more but two are fundamental. Generally speaking, they are two. The first is that the individual is an end in himself and that the aim and object of society is the growth of the individual and the development of his personality. Society is not above the individual and if the individual has to subordinate himself to society, it is because such subordination is for his betterment and only to the extent necessary.

The second essential is that the terms of associated life between members of society must be regarded by consideration founded on liberty, equality and fraternity.

Why are these two essentials fundamental to a free social order?

Why must the individual be the end and not the means of all social purposes? For an answer to this question, it is necessary to realise what we precisely mean when we speak of the human person. Why should we sacrifice our most precious possessions and our lives to defend the rights of the human person? No better answer to this question can be found than what is given by Prof. Jacques Maritain. As Prof. Maritain in his essay on 'The Conquest of Freedom' <sup>1</sup> says:—

“What do we mean precisely when we speak of the human person? When we say that a man is a person, we do not mean merely that he is an individual, in the sense that an atom, a blade of grass, a fly, or an elephant is an individual. Man is an individual who holds himself in hand by his intelligence and his will; he exists not merely in a physical fashion. He has spiritual super-existence through knowledge and love, so that he is, in a way, a universe in

<sup>1</sup> Freedom—Its Meaning by Ruth Nanda Kishen, p. 214.

himself, a microcosmos, in which the great universe in its entirety can be encompassed through knowledge. By love he can give himself completely to beings who are to him, as it were, other selves. For this relation no equivalent can be found in the physical world. The human person possesses these characteristics because in the last analysis man, this flesh and these perishable bones which are animated and activated by a divine fire, exists 'from the womb to the grave' by virtue of the existence itself of his soul, which dominates time and death. Spirit is the root of personality. The notion of personality thus involves that of totality and independence, no matter how poor and crushed a person may be, he is a whole, and as a person subsistent in an independent manner. To say that a man is a person is to say that in the depth of his being he is more a whole than a part and more independent than servile. It is to say that he is a minute fragment of matter that is at the same time a universe, a beggar who participates in the absolute being, mortal flesh whose value is external and a bit of straw into which heaven enters. It is this metaphysical mystery that religious thought designates when it says that the person is the image of God. The value of the person, his dignity and rights, belong to the order of things naturally sacred which bear the imprint of the Father of Being, and which have in him the end of their movement."

Why is Equality essential? The best exposition of the subject is by Prof. Beard in his essay on 'Freedom in Political Thought' and I shall do no more than quote him. Says Prof. Beard<sup>1</sup>:—

"The term 'Equality' is unfortunate, but no other word can be found as a substitute. Equality means 'exactly the same or equivalent in measure, amount, number, degree, value, or quality'. It is a term exact enough in physics and mathematics, but obviously inexact when applied to human beings. What is meant by writers who have gone deepest into the subject is that human beings possess, in degree and kind, fundamental characteristics that are common to humanity. These writers hold that when humanity is stripped of extrinsic goods and conventions incidental to time and place, it reveals essential characteristics so widely distributed as to partake of universality. Whether these characteristics be called primordial qualities, biological necessities, residues or any other name matters little. No one can truthfully deny that they do exist. It is easy to point out inequalities in physical strength, in artistic skill, in material wealth, or in mental capacity, but this too is a matter of emphasis. At the end it remains a fact that fundamental

<sup>1</sup> Freedom—Its Meaning—pp. 11-13.

characteristics appear in all human beings. Their nature and manifestations are summed up in the phrase 'moral equality'.

Emphasis must be placed on the term 'moral'. From time immemorial it has been the fashion of critics to point out the obvious facts that in physical strength, talents, and wealth, human beings are not equal. The criticism is both gratuitous and irrelevant. No rational exponent of moral equality has even disputed the existence of obvious inequalities among human beings, even when he has pointed out inequalities which may be ascribed to tyranny or institutional prescriptions. The Declaration of Independence does not assert that all men are equal; it proclaims that they are 'created' equal.

In essence the phrase 'moral equality' asserts in ethical value, a belief to be sustained, and recognition of rights to be respected. Its validity cannot be demonstrated as a problem in mathematics can be demonstrated. It is asserted against inequalities in physical strength, talents, industry, and wealth. It denied that superior physical strength has a moral right to kill, eat, or oppress human beings merely because it is superior. To talents and wealth, the ideal of moral equality makes a similar denial of right. And indeed few can imagine themselves to have superior physical strength, talents and wealth will withhold from inferiors all moral rights. In such circumstances government and wealth would go to superior physical strength; while virtue and talents would serve the brute man, as accomplished Greek slaves served the whims, passions and desires to Roman conquerors. When the last bitter word of criticism has been uttered against the ideal of moral equality, there remains something in it which all, except things, must accept and in practice do accept, despite their sheers and protests. A society without any respect for human personalities is a band of robbers."

Why is Fraternity essential?

Fraternity is the name for the disposition of an individual to treat men as the object of reverence and love and the desire to be in unity with his fellow beings. This statement is well expressed by Paul when he said 'Of one blood are all nations of men. There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female; for yet are all one in Christ Jesus.' Equally well was it expressed when the Pilgrim Fathers on their landing at Plymouth said: "We are knit together as a body in the most sacred covenant of the Lord. . . . by virtue of which we hold ourselves tied to all care of each others' good and of the whole." These sentiments are of the essence of fraternity. Fraternity strengthens socialties and gives to each individual a stronger personal

interest in practically consulting the welfare of others. It leads him to identify his feelings more and more with their good, or at least with an even greater degree of practical consideration for it. With a disposition to fraternity he comes as though instructively to be conscious of himself as being one who of course pays a regard to others. The good of others becomes to him a thing naturally and necessarily to be attended to like any of the physical conditions of our existence. Where people do not feel that entireness of sympathy with all others, concordance in the general direction of their conduct is impossible. For a person in whom social feeling is not developed cannot but bring himself to think of the rest of his fellow-beings as rivals struggling with him for the means of happiness when he must endeavour to defeat in order that he may succeed in himself.

What is Liberty and why is it essential in a free social order?

Liberty falls under two classes. There is civil liberty and there is political liberty. Civil liberty refers to (1) liberty of movement which is another name for freedom from arrest without due process of law (2) liberty of speech (which of course includes liberty of thought, liberty of reading, writing and discussion) and (3) liberty of action.

The first kind of liberty is of course fundamental. Not only fundamental it is also most essential. About its value, there can be no manner of doubt. The second kind of liberty which may be called freedom of opinion is important for many reasons. It is a necessary condition of all progress intellectual, moral, political and social. Where it does not exist the status quo becomes stereotyped and all originality even the most necessary is discouraged. Liberty of action means doing what one likes to do. It is not enough that liberty of action should be formal. It must be real. So understood, liberty of action means effective power to do specific things. There is no freedom where there are no means of taking advantage of it. Real liberty of action exists only where exploitation has been annihilated, where no suppression of one class by another exists, where there is no unemployment, no poverty and where a person is free from the fear of losing his job, his home and his food as a consequence of his action.

Political liberty consists in the right of the individual to share in the framing of laws and in the making and unmaking of governments. Governments are instituted for securing to men certain unalienable rights such as life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. Government must, therefore, derive its powers from those whose rights it is charged with the duty to protect. This is what is meant when it is said that the existence, power and authority of the Government must be derived from the consent of the governed. Political liberty is really a deduction

from the principle of human personality and equality. For it implies that all political authority is derived from the people that the people are capable of directing and controlling their public as well as private lives to ends determined by themselves and by none else.

These two tenets of a free social order are integrally connected. They are inseverable. Once the first tenet is admitted, the second tenet automatically follows. Once the sacredness of human personality is admitted the necessity of liberty, equality and fraternity must also be admitted as the proper climate for the development of personality.

## II

How far does the Hindu social order recognise these tenets? The inquiry is necessary. For it is only in so far as it recognizes these tenets that it will have the title to be called a free social order.

Does the Hindu social order recognise the individual? Does it recognise his distinctiveness his moral responsibility? Does it recognise him as an end in himself, as a subject not merely of disabilities but also of rights even against the State? As a starting point for the discussion of the subject one may begin by referring to the words of the exodus where Jehova says to Ezekiel:—

“Behold! all souls are mine; as the soul of the Father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die. . . . the son shall not bear the iniquity of the Father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked upon him.”

Here is emphasized the distinctiveness of the individual and his moral responsibility. The Hindu social order does not recognise the individual as a centre of social purpose. For the Hindu social order is based primarily on class or Varna and not on individuals. Originally and formally the Hindu social order recognized four classes: (1) Brahmins, (2) Kshatriyas (3) Vaishyas and (4) Shudras. Today it consists of five classes, the fifth being called the Panchamas or Untouchables. The unit of Hindu society is not the individual Brahmin or the individual Kshatriya or the individual Vaishya or the individual Shudra or the individual Panchama. Even the family is not regarded by the Hindu social order as the unit of society except for the purposes of marriage and inheritance. The unit of Hindu society is the class or Varna to use the Hindu technical name for class. In the Hindu social order, there is no room for individual merit and no consideration of individual justice. If the individual has a privilege it is not because it is due to him personally. The privilege goes with the class, and if he is

found to enjoy it, it is because he belongs to that class. Contrawise, if an individual is suffering from a wrong, it is not because he by his conduct deserves it. The disability is the disability imposed upon the class and if he is found to be labouring under it, it is because he belongs to that class.

Does the Hindu social order recognize fraternity? The Hindus like the Christians and the Muslims do believe that men are created by God. But while the Christians and the Muslims accept this as the whole truth the Hindus believe that this is only part of the truth. According to them, the whole truth consists of two parts. The first part is that men are created by God. The second part is that God created different men from different parts of his divine body. The Hindus regard the second part as more important and more fundamental than the first.

The Hindu social order is based on the doctrine that men are created from the *different parts* of the divinity and therefore the view expressed by Paul or the Pilgrim Fathers has no place in it. The Brahmin is no brother to the Kshatriya because the former is born from the mouth of the divinity while the latter is from the arms. The Kshatriya is no brother to the Vaishya because the former is born from the arms and the latter from his thighs. As no one is a brother to the other, no one is the keeper of the other.

The doctrine that the different classes were created from different parts of the Divine body has generated the belief that it must be divine will that they should remain separate and distinct. It is this belief which has created in the Hindu an instinct to be different, to be separate and to be distinct from the rest of his fellow Hindus. Compare the following rules in the Manu Smriti regarding the Upanayan or the Investiture of a body with the sacred thread :—

II. 36. “In the eighth year after conception, one should perform the initiation (Upanayan) of a Brahmani in the eleventh after conception (that) of a Kshatriya but in the twelfth that of a Vaishya.”

II. 41. “Let students according to the order (of their castes), wear (as upper dressed) the skins of black antelope, spotted deer, and he-goats and (lower garments) made of hemp, flex or wool.”

II. 42. “The girdle of a Brahmana shall consist of a triple cord of Munga grass, smooth and soft (that) of a Kshatriya, of a bowstring, made of Murva fibres (that) of a Vaishya of hempen threads.

II. 43. “If Munga grass (and so forth) be not procurable, (the girdles) may be made of kusa, Asmantaka, and Balbaga (fibres) with



a single threefold knot, or with three or five (knots according to the custom of the family.”

II. 44. “The sacrificial string of a Brahmana shall be made of cotton (shall be) twisted to the right, (and consist) of three threads, that of a Kshatriya of hempen threads, and that of a Vaishya of woolen threads.

II. 45. “A Brahmana shall carry according to sacred law a staff of Bilva or Palasa, a Kshatriya of Vata or Khadira; and a Vaishya of Pillu or Udumbara.”

II. 46. “The staff of a Brahmana shall be made of such length as to reach the end of his hair; that of a Kshatriya to reach his forehead; and that of a Vaishya to reach the tip of his nose.”

II. 48. “Having taken a staff according to his choice having worshipped the Sun and walked round the fire, turning his right hand towards it (the student) should beg alms according to the prescribed rule.”

II. 49. “An initiated Brahmana should beg, beginning his request with the word *lady* (bhavati); a Kshatriya placing the word *lady* in the middle, but a Vaishya placing *it* at the end of the formula.”

On reading this one may well ask the reasons for such distinctions. The above rules refer to students or what are called Bramhacharia ready to enter upon the study of the Vedas. Why should there be these distinctions? Why should the ages of Upanayana of the Brahmin boy differ from that of the Kshatriya or Vaishya? Why should their garments be of different kind? Why should their materials of girdle cords be different? Why should the material of strings be different? Why should their staves be of different trees? Why should their staves differ in length? Why in uttering the formula for asking alms they should place the word ‘Bhavathi’ in different places? These differences are not necessary nor advantageous. The only answer is that they are the result of the Hindu instinct to be different from his fellow which has resulted from the belief of people being innately different owing to their being created from different parts of the divine body.

It is also the Hindu instinct due to the same belief never to overlook a difference if it does exist but to emphasize it, recognize it and to blazen it forth. If there is caste its existence must be signalized by a distinguishing head-dress and by a distinguishing name. If there is a sect it must have its headmark. There are 92 sects in India. Each has a separate mark of itself. To invent 92 marks each one different from the other is a colossal business. The very impossibility of it would have made the most ingenious person to give up the task. Yet, the Hindus

have accomplished it as may be seen from the pictorial representation of these marks given by Moore in his Hindu Pantheon.

The most extensive and wild manifestation of this spirit of isolation and separation is of course the caste-system. It is understandable that caste in a single number cannot exist. Caste can exist only in plural number. There can be castes. But there cannot be such a thing as a caste. But granting that theoretically castes must exist in plural number how many castes should there be? Originally, there were four only. Today, how many are there? It is estimated that the total is not less than 2000. It might be 3000. This is not the only staggering aspect of this fact. There are others. Castes are divided into sub-castes. Their number is legion. The total population of the Brahmin castes is about a crore and a half. But there are 1886 sub-castes of Brahmin caste!! In the Punjab alone, the Saraswat Brahmans are divided into 469 sub-castes. The Kayasthas of Punjab are divided into 890 sub-castes!! One could go on giving figures to show this infinite process of splitting social life into small fragments. The splitting process has made a social life quite impossible. It has made the castes split into such small fragments that it has marital relationship consistent with the rule of excluded degrees quite impossible. Some of the Baniya sub-castes count no more than 100 families. They are so interrelated they find it extremely difficult to marry within their castes without transgressing the rules of consanguinity.

It is noteworthy that small excuses suffice to bring about this splitting of castes into sub-castes. Castes become sub-divided into sub-castes by reason of change of location, change of occupation, change in social practices, change due to pollution, changes due to increased prosperity, changes due to quarrel and changes due to change of religion. Mr. Blunt has given many instances to illustrate this tendency among the Hindus. There is no space to reproduce all except one which shows how ordinary quarrels lead to the splitting one caste into sub-castes. As stated by Mr. Blunt<sup>1</sup>:—

“In Lucknow there was a sub-caste of Khatika consisting of three *ghols or groups*, known as Manikpur, Jaiswala and Dalman. They inter-married, ate together, and met together in panchayat under the presidency of their *Chaudharis* or headmen. Twenty years ago each group had one Chaudhri, but now Jaiswala have three and Manikpur two. The quarrel was as follows. Firstly a woman (her *ghol* is not given) peddled fruit about the streets. The brethren ordered her to desist from the practice, which is derogatory to the caste's dignity; women should only sell in shops. Her husband and

<sup>1</sup> “The Caste system of Northern India” pp. 51-56.

she proved contumacious; and finally their own ghol, acting singly, outcasted the man. The Dalmu ghol, however, dissenting from this action admitted the husband to communion with themselves upon payment of a fine of Rs. 80 in lieu of excommunication. Secondly a man (the ghol, again is not given) was excommunicated by his own ghol, acting alone; and while his case was under trial, the Jaiswala Chaudhri invited him to dinner by mistake. Thereupon, the three ghols, acting in concert, fined the Chaudhri Rs. 30. Lastly, fines had accumulated and it was decided to hold a *Katha* (sacred recitation). The Dalmu Chaudhri said he preferred to have his share of money; but the Manikpur Chaudhri (who seems to have kept the joint purse) refused, taking up the attitude that there was going to be a *Katha* to which the Dalmu people could come or not as they liked. The matter at this stage was brought into court; meanwhile the three ghols ceased to inter-marry, so that one endogamous sub-caste split into three quarrels, ghol was pitted against ghol.

If in any caste a group should adopt some new or unusual worship of which other members do not approve, one would expect that group to break off and become an endogamous sub-caste. That such sub-castes are uncommon is due to the tolerance about what and with whom he eats and whom he marries. We do, however, find that the Mahabhira and Panchipriya sub-castes amongst Telis, Koris and the Namakshalis amongst Barhais, Bhangis and Kadheras."

How do these castes behave towards one another. Their guiding principle is 'be separate', 'do not intermarry', 'do not interdine' and 'do not touch'. Mr. Blunt<sup>1</sup> has well described the situation when he says:

"A Hindu sits down to a meal either alone or with his caste fellows. The women cannot eat with the men; they wait till their lords have finished. So long as the meal or a part of it consists of *Kachcha* food (as it usually does, since Chapatis appear at most meals), the man must dine with the precautions of a magic ceremony. He sits within a square marked off on the ground (chauka) inside which is the *Chulha* or cooking place. Should a stranger's shadow fall upon this square, all food cooked within it is polluted and must be thrown away. In camp, Hindu servants may be seen, each well apart from the rest, each within his own chauka, cooking his food upon his own mud oven and eating alone.....

"Rules regarding the acceptance of water are on the whole the same as those regarding the acceptance of a pakka food, but with

a tendency to greater laxity. The vessel in which the water is contained affects the question. A high caste man will allow a low caste man to fill his *lota* (drinking vessel) for him; but he will not drink from the *lota* of that low caste man. Or a high caste man will give anybody (save Untouchables) a drink, by pouring water from his own *lota* into that of the drinker; all the men employed at stations to supply railway travellers with water are Barhais, Baris, Bharbhunjas, Halwais, Kahars, and Nais; and of course from higher castes still.

Rules regarding smoking are stricter. It is very seldom that a man will smoke with anybody but a caste fellow; the reason, no doubt is that smoking with a man usually involves smoking his pipe, and this involves much closer contact even than eating food which he has prepared. So stringent is this rule, indeed, that the fact that Jats, Ahirs, and Gujars will smoke together has been regarded as a ground for supposing that they are closely akin. Some castes, the Kayastha for instance, differentiates between smoking in narial fashion in which the hands are closed round the pipe and the smoke is drawn in without putting the stem actually in the mouth—and smoking in the usual way. Little need be said on the subject of vessels. There are rules laying down what sort of vessels should be made, but they are rather religious than social. Hindus must use brass or alloy (although the use of alloy is hedged about by numerous and minute injunctions, and if such vessels become impure, the only remedy is to get them remoulded). The risk of pollution makes it imperative for every man to have a few vessels of his own. The minimum consists of a *lota* (drinking vessel), *batna* (cooking pot), and *thali* (dish). Better class folk add a *Katora* (spoon) and *Gagra* (Water pot). For feasts, the brotherhood usually keep a set of larger vessels of all kinds, which they lend to the host; these are bought with the proceeds of fines, and are common property.<sup>1</sup>

What fraternity can there be in a social order based upon such sentiments? Far from working in a spirit of fraternity the mutual relations of the castes are fratricidal. Class consciousness, class struggle and class war are supposed to be ideologies which came into vogue from the writings of Karl Marx. This is a complete mistake. India is the land which has experienced class consciousness, class struggle. Indeed, India is the land where there has been fought a class war between Brahmans and Kshatriyas<sup>2</sup> which lasted for several

<sup>1</sup> In the Northern India the bar to eating together applies only when the food is kachcha food. In Southern India the bar is complete and applies even when the food is pucca food. Kachcha food is food cooked in water. Pucca food is food cooked in ghee.

generations and which was fought so hard and with such virulence that it turned but to be a war of extermination.

It must not be supposed that the fratricidal spirit has given place to a spirit of fraternity. The same spirit of separation marks the Hindu social order today as may be seen from what follows:

Each class claims a separate origin. Some claim origin from a Rishi or from a hero. But in each case it is a different Rishi or a different hero having nothing to do with the Rishis and heroes claimed by other castes as their progenitors. Each caste is engaged in nothing but establishing for itself a status superior to that of another caste. This is best illustrated by rules of hypercommensality and rules of hypergamy. As pointed out by Mr. Blunt<sup>1</sup>:

"It is essential to realize that in respect of the cooking taboo, the criterion is the caste of the person who cooks the food, not the caste of the person who offers it. It follows, therefore, that a high caste Hindu can eat the food of a man of any caste, however low, if his host possesses a cook of suitable caste. And that is why so many cooks are Brahmins. The Hindu draws a distinction between kachcha food, which is cooked in water and pucca food which is cooked with ghee (clarified butter). This distinction depends on the principle that ghee, like all the products of the sacred cow, protects from impurity, and since such protection is the object of all food taboos, this convenient fiction enables the Hindu to be less particular in the case of pucca food than of kachcha food, and to relax his restrictions accordingly:

Speaking of hypergamy, Mr. Blunt<sup>2</sup> says:—

"The custom of hypergamy introduces an important modification into the marriage laws of many castes. Where it prevails, the exogamous groups are classified according to their social position; and whilst a group of highest rank will take brides from it, it will not give brides to a group of lower rank. The law is found most highly developed amongst Rajputs but it is observed by many other castes. . . . Indeed amongst all Hindus there is probably a tendency towards hypergamy."

What is it that has behind these rules regarding hyper-commensality and hypergamy? Nothing else but the spirit of high and low. All castes are infested with that spirit and there is no caste which is free from it. The Hindu social order is a ladder of castes placed one above the other together representing an ascending scale of hatred and a descending scale of contempt.

<sup>1</sup> 'The Caste system of Northern India' pp. 89-90.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 'The Caste system of Northern India'.

This spirit has exhibited itself in the proverbs coined by one caste with the object of lampooning another caste. It has given rise even to literature by authors of low castes suggesting filthy origin of the so-called high caste. The Sahyadrikhand is the best illustration of it. It is one of the Puranas which form part of the Hindu sacred literature. It is a Purana of a style quite different from the traditional puranas. It deals with the origin of the different castes. In doing so, it assigns noble origin to other castes while it assigns to the Brahmin caste the filthiest origin.

Does the Hindu social order recognise equality? The answer must be in the negative. That men are born equal is a doctrine which is repugnant to the Hindu social order. In the spiritual sense it treats the doctrine as false. According to the Hindu social order though it is true that men are the children of Prajapati the Creator of the Universe, they are not equal on that account. For, they were created from the different parts of the body of Prajapati. The Brahmins were created from the mouth, the Kshatriyas from the arms, the Vaishyas from his thighs and Shudras from his feet. The limbs from which they were created being of unequal value the men thus created are as unequal. In the biological sense, the Hindu social order does not bother to examine whether the doctrine is founded in a fact. If it was not a fact, i.e., men were not equal in their character and natural endowments of character and intelligence so much the better. On the other hand, if it was a fact, i.e., men were equal in character and natural endowments, so much the worse for the doctrine. The Hindu social order is indifferent to the doctrine as a fact. It is equally indifferent to it as an ethical principle. It refuses to recognise that men no matter how profoundly they differ as individuals in capacity and character, are equally entitled as human beings to consideration and respect and that the well-being of a society is likely to be increased if it so plans its organization that, whether their powers are great or small, all its members may be equally enabled to make the best of such powers as they possess. It will not allow equality of circumstances, institutions and manner of life. It is against equalitarian temper.

### III

If the Hindu social order is not based on equality and fraternity, what are the principles on which it is based? There is only one answer to this question. Though few will be able to realize what they are, there is no doubt as to their nature and effect on Hindu society. The Hindu social order is reared on three principles. Among these the first and foremost is the principle of graded inequality.

That the principle of graded inequality is a fundamental principle is beyond controversy. The four classes are not on horizontal plane, different but equal. They are on vertical plane. Not only different but unequal in status, one standing above the other. In the scheme of Manu, the Brahmin is placed at the first in rank. Below him is the Kshatriya. Below the Kshatriya is the Vaishya. Below Vaishya is the Shudra and below Shudra is the Ati-shudra or the Untouchable. This order of precedence among the classes is not merely conventional. It is spiritual, moral and legal. There is no sphere of life which is not regulated by this principle of graded inequality.

One can substantiate this by numerous illustrations from the Manu Smriti. I will take four illustrations to prove the point. They will be the law of slavery, law of marriage, law of punishment and law of Samskaras and law of Sanyas. The Hindu law recognised slavery as a legal institution. Manu Smriti recognised seven kinds of slaves. Narada Smriti recognised fifteen kinds of slaves. These differences as to the number of slaves and the classes under which they fall is a matter of no importance. What is important is to know who could enslave whom. On this point, the following citations from the Narada Smriti and the Yajnavalkya Smriti are revealing :

*Narada Smriti* : V. 39. " In the inverse order of four castes slavery is not ordained except where a man violates the duties peculiar to his caste. Slavery (in that respect) is analogous to the condition of a wife. "

*Yajnavalkya Smriti* : XVI. 183 (2). " Slavery is in the descending order of the Varnas and not in the ascending order. "

Recognition of slavery was bad enough. But if the rule of slavery had been left free to take its own course it would have had at least one beneficial effect. It would have been a levelling force. The foundation of caste would have been destroyed. For under it, a Brahmin might have become the slave of the Untouchables and the Untouchables would have become the masters of the Brahmin. But it was seen that unfettered slavery was an equitarian principle and an attempt was made to nullify it. Manu and his successors therefore while recognising slavery ordian that it shall not be recognized in its inverse order to the Varna system. That means that a Brahmin may become the slave of another Brahmin. But he shall not be the slave of a person of another Varna, i.e., of the Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra, or Ati-Shudra. On the other hand, a Brahmin may hold as his slave anyone belonging to the four Varnas. A Kshatriya can have a Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra and Ati-Shudra as his slaves but not one who is a Brahmin. A Vaishya can have a Vaishya, Shudra and Ati-Shudra as his slaves but not one who is a Brahmin or a Kshatriya. A Shudra can hold a Shudra and

an Ati-Shudra, as his slaves but not one who is a Brahmin, Kshatriya or a Vaishya. Ati-Shudra can hold an Ati-Shudra as his slave but not one who is a Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya or Shudra.

Another illustration of this principle of graded inequality is to be found in the Laws of marriage. Manu says:—

III. 12. "For the first marriage of the twice-born classes, a woman of the same class is recommended but for such as are impelled by inclination to marry again, women in the direct order of the classes are to be preferred."

III. 13. "A Shudra woman only must be the wife of a Shudra; she and a Vaishya, of a Vaishya; they two and a Kshatriya of a Kshatriya; those three and a Brahmani of a Brahmin."

Manu is of course opposed to inter-marriage. His injunction is for each class to marry within his class. But he does recognize marriage outside the defined class. Here again, he is particularly careful not to allow inter-marriage to do harm to his principle of inequality among classes. Like slavery he permits inter-marriage but not in the inverse order. A Brahmin when marrying outside his class may marry any woman from any of the classes below him. A Kshatriya is free to marry a woman from the two classes next below him, namely, the Vaishya and Shudra but must not marry a woman from the Brahmin class which is above him. A Vaishya is free to marry a woman from the Shudra class which is next below him. But he cannot marry a woman from the Brahmin and the Kshatriya class which are above him.

The third illustration is to be found in the Rule of Law as enunciated by Manu. First as to treatment to be given to witnesses. According to Manu, they are to be sworn as follows:

VIII. 87. "In the forenoon let the judge, being purified, severally call on the twice-born, being purified also, to declare the truth, in the presence of some image, a symbol of the divinity and of Brahmins, while the witnesses turn their faces either to the north or to the east."

VIII. 88. "To a Brahmin he must begin with saying 'Declare'; to a Kshatriya, with saying 'Declare the truth'; to a Vaishya admonishing him by mentioning his kine, grain or gold; to a Shudra, threatening him with the guilt of every crime that causes loss of caste."

Take the punishment of offences as laid down by Manu. To begin with, punishment for defamation:

VIII. 267. "A soldier, defaming a priest, shall be fined a hundred panas; merchant thus offending, a hundred and fifty, or two hundred; but for such an offence a mechanic or servile man shall be whipped."



VIII. 268. "A priest shall be fined fifty if he slanders a soldier; twenty-five if a merchant and twelve if he slanders a man of the servile class."

Take the offence of insults. The punishment prescribed by Manu is as follows:

VIII. 270. "A Shudra who insults a Dvija with gross invectives, ought to have his tongue slit for he sprang from the lowest part of Brahma."

VIII. 271. "If he mentions their names and classes with contumely, as if he says, 'Oh Devadatta, thou refuse of Brahmin'; an iron style, ten fingers long, shall be thrust red into his mouth."

VIII. 272. "Should he, through pride, give instructions to Brahmins concerning their duty; let the king order some hot oil to be dropped into his mouth and his ear."

Punishment for the offence of abuse. Manu says:

VIII. 276. "For mutual abuse by a Brahmin and a Kshatriya, this fine must be imposed by a learned king; the lowest on the Brahmin and the middlemost on the soldier."

VIII. 277. "A Vaishya and a Shudra must be punished exactly in the same manner according to their respective castes, except the slitting of the tongue of the Shudras. This is the fixed rule of punishment."

Punishment for the offence of assault. Manu propounds:

VIII. 279. "With whatever limb a Shudra shall assault or hurt a Dvija that limb of his shall be cut off, this is in accordance of Manu."

Punishment for the offence of arrogance. According to Manu:

VIII. 281. "A Shudra who shall insolently place himself on the same seat with a man of high caste, shall either be branded on his hip and be banished or the King shall cause a gash to be made on his buttock."

VIII. 282. "Should he spit on him through pride, the king shall order both his lips to be gashed; should he urinate on him, his penis; should he break wind against him, his anus."

VIII. 283. "If he seizes the Brahmin by the locks or likewise if he takes him by the feet, let the king unhesitatingly cut off his hands, or by the beard, or by the throat or by the scrotum."

Punishment for the offence of adultery. Says Manu.

VIII. 359. "A man who is not a Brahmin who commits actual adultery ought to suffer death; for the wives, indeed of all the four classes must ever be most especially guarded."

VIII. 366. "A Shudra who makes love to a damsel of high birth, ought to be punished corporally; but he who addresses a maid of equal rank, shall give the nuptial present and marry her, if her father desires it."

VIII. 374. "A Shudra having an adulterous connection with a woman of a twice-born class, whether guarded at home or unguarded shall thus be punished in the following manner; if she was unguarded, he shall lose the part offending and all his property; if guarded everything even his life."

VIII. 375. "For adultery with a guarded Brahmin a Vaishya shall forfeit all his wealth after imprisonment for a year; a Kshatriya shall be fined a thousand panas, and he be shaved with the urine of an ass."

VIII. 376. "But if a Vaishya or Kshatriya commits adultery with an unguarded Brahmin, the king shall only fine the Vaishya five hundred panas and the Kshatriya a thousand."

VIII. 377. "But even these two however, if they commit that offence with a Brahmani not only guarded but the wife of an eminent man, shall be punished like a Shudra or be burned in a fire of dry grass or reeds."

VIII. 382. "If a Vaishya approaches a guarded female of the Kshatriya or a Kshatriya a guarded Vaishya woman, they both deserve the same punishment as in the case of an unguarded Brahmin female."

VIII. 383. "But a Brahmin, who shall commit adultery with a guarded woman of those two classes, must be fined a thousand panas, and for the offending with a Shudra woman the fine of a thousand panas on a Kshatriya or Vaishya."

VIII. 384. "For adultery by a Vaishya with a woman of the Kshatriya classes, if guarded, the fine is five hundred; but a Kshatriya for committing adultery on a Vaishya woman must be shaved with urine or pay the fine just mentioned."

How strange is the contrast between Hindu and non-Hindu criminal jurisprudence! How inequality is writ large in Hinduism as seen in its criminal jurisprudence! In a Penal Code charged with the spirit of justice we find two things—a section dealing with defining the crime and a section prescribing a rational form of punishment for breach of it and a rule that all offenders are liable to the same penalty. In Manu, what do we find? First an irrational system of punishment. The punishment for a crime is inflicted on the organ concerned in the crime such as belly, tongue, nose, eyes, ears, organs of generation etc., as if

the offending organ was sentiment having a will for its own and had not been merely a survivor of human being. Second feature of Manu's Penal Code is the inhuman character of the punishment which has no proportion to the gravity of the offence. But the most striking feature of Manu's Penal Code which stands out in all its nakedness is the inequality of punishment for the same offence. Inequality designed not merely to punish the offender but to protect also the dignity and to maintain the baseness of the parties coming to a Court of Law to seek justice; in other words to maintain the social inequality on which his whole scheme is founded.

The principle of graded inequality has been carried into the economic field. "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need" is not the principle of Hindu social order. The principle of the Hindu social order is: "From each according to his need. To each according to his nobility." <sup>1</sup>Supposing an officer was distributing dole to a famine stricken people. He would be bound to give greater dole to a person of high birth than he would to a person of low birth. Supposing an officer was levying taxation. He would be bound to assess a person of high birth at a lower rate than he would to a person of low birth. The Hindu social order does not recognise equal need, equal work or equal ability as the basis of reward for labour. Its motto is that in regard to the distribution of the good things of life those who are reckoned as the highest must get the most and the best and those who are classed as the lowest must accept the least and the worst.

Nothing more seems to be necessary to prove that the Hindu social order is based on the principle of graded inequality. It pervades all departments of social life. Every side of social life is protected against the danger of equality.

The second principle on which the Hindu social order is founded is that of fixity of occupations for each class and continuance thereof by heredity. This is what Manu says about occupations of the four classes.

"I. 87. But in order to protect this universe, He, the most resplendent one, assigned separate (duties and) occupations, to those who sprang from his mouth, arms, thighs and feet.

I. 88. To Brahmanas he assigned teaching and studying (the Veda) sacrificing for their own benefit and for others, giving and accepting (of alms).

I. 89. The Kshatriya he commanded to protect the people, to bestow gifts to offer sacrifices to study (the Veda) and to abstain from attaching himself to sensual pleasures."

<sup>1</sup> The illustrations given above are not merely drawn from imagination. They are facts of history. The differentiation between high and low was recognised by law in the time of the Peshwas. The differentiation about dole exists even now in the Bombay Presidency and was defended by a Congress Minister. *These Remarks are not applicable today*—Editors.

"I. 90. The Vaishya to tend cattle to bestow gifts to offer sacrifices to study (the Veda) and to abstain from attaching himself to sensual pleasures."

I. 91. One occupation only the Lord prescribed to the Shudra, to serve meekly even these (other) three castes."

These rules regarding the occupations of the different classes are further amplified by Manu as will be seen from the following citations from his Smriti:

"I. 88. To Brahmans he (Swayambhu Manu) assigned the duties of reading the Veda, of teaching it, of sacrificing, of assisting others to sacrifice, of giving alms if they be rich, and if indigent of receiving of gifts.

I. 89. To defend the people, to give alms, to sacrifice, to read the Veda, to shun the allurements of sensual gratification, are in a few words, the duties of a Kshatriya.

I. 90. To keep herds of cattle, to bestow largeness, to sacrifice, to read the scriptures, to carry on trade, to lend at interest, and to cultivate land are prescribed or permitted to a Vaishya.

I. 91. One principal duty the supreme Ruler assigns to a Shudra; namely, to serve the beforementioned classes, without depreciating their worth.

X. 74. Let such Brahmans as are intent on the means of attaining the supreme godhead, and firm in their own duties, completely perform in order, the six following acts.

X. 75. Reading the Vedas, the teaching others to read them, sacrificing, and assisting others to sacrifice, giving to the poor if themselves have enough, and accepting gifts from the virtuous if themselves are poor, are the six prescribed acts of the firstborn class."

"X. 76. But, among those six acts of a Brahman three are his means of subsistence; assisting to sacrifice, teaching the Vedas and receiving gifts from a purehanded giver.

X. 77. Three acts of duty cease with the Brahman and belong not to the Kshatriya, teaching the Vedas, officiating at a sacrifice and thirdly receiving presents.

X. 78. Those three are also (by the fixed rule of law) forbidden to the Vaishya since Manu, the Lord of all men, prescribed not those acts to the two classes, military and commercial.

X. 79. The means of subsistence peculiar to the Kshatriya are bearing arms, either held for striking or missile; to the Vaishya, merchandise, attending on cattle, and agriculture; but with a view to the next life, the duties of both are alms giving, reading and sacrificing."

Every member must follow the trade assigned to the class to which he belongs. It leaves no scope for individual choice, individual inclination. An individual under the Hindu social order is bound to the profession of his ancestor. It is an inexorable law from which he cannot escape.

The principle does not stop with fixity of occupation. It grades the several occupations in terms of respectability. This is what Manu says:—

“X. 80. Among the several occupations for gaining a livelihood the most commendable respectively for the Brahmans, Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas are the teaching of the Vedas, defending the people and trade.

The third principle on which the Hindu social order is founded is the fixation of people within their respective classes. There is nothing strange or peculiar in the fact that the Hindu social order recognizes classes. There are classes everywhere and no society is without them. Families, cliques, clubs, political parties, nay communities, gangs engaged in criminal conspiracies, business corporations which prey upon the public are to be found in all societies in all parts of the world. Even a free social order will not be able to get rid of the classes. What a free social order aims to do is to prevent isolation and exclusiveness being regarded by the classes as an ideal to be followed. For so long as the classes do not practise isolation and exclusiveness they are only non-social in their relations towards one another. Isolation and exclusiveness make them anti-social and inimical towards one another. Isolation makes for rigidity of class consciousness, for institutionalizing social life and for the dominance of selfish ideals within the classes. Isolation makes life static, continues the separation into a privileged and underprivileged, masters and servants.

Not so much the existence of classes as the spirit of isolation and exclusiveness which is inimical with a free social order. What a free social order endeavours to do is to maintain all channels of social endosmosis. This is possible only when the classes are free to share in an extensive number of common interests, undertakings and expenses, have a large number of values in common, when there is a free play back and forth, when they have an equable opportunity to receive and to take from others. Such social contacts must and does dissolve custom, makes for an alert and expanding mental life and not only occasion but demand reconstruction of mental attitudes. What is striking about the Hindu social order is its ban on free inter-change and inter-course between different classes of Hindu society. There is a bar against inter-dining and inter-marriage. But Manu goes to the length of interdicting ordinary social intercourse. Says Manu:

IV. 244. "He, who seeks to preserve an exalted rank, must constantly form connections with the highest and best families, but avoid the worst and the meanest.

IV. 245. Since a priest, who connects himself with the best and the highest of men, avoiding the lowest and worst, attains eminence; but sinks by an opposite conduct, to the class of the servile.

IV. 79. Not let him tarry even under the shade of the same tree with outcaste *for the great crimes*, nor with Chandalas, nor with Puccasas, nor with idiots, nor with man proud of wealth, nor with washermen and other vile persons, nor with Antyevasins."

The Hindu social order is opposed to fraternity. It does not admit the principle of equality. Far from recognising equality it makes inequality its official doctrine. What about liberty? So far as choice of occupation goes, there is none. Everyone has his occupation determined for him. Only thing left to do is to carry it on. As to freedom of speech it exists. But it exists only for those who are in favour of the social order. The freedom is not the freedom of liberalism which was expressed by Voltaire when he said "I wholly disapprove of what you say and will defend to the death your right to say it." This is clear from what Manu has to say about Logic and dialectics.

"IV. 29-30. No guest must stay in his house without being honoured according to his ability, with a seat, food, a couch, water, or roots and fruits.

Let him not honour even by a greeting heretics, men who follow forbidden occupations, men who live like cats, rogues, logicians (arguing against the Veda) and those who live like herons.

II. 10. But by Sruti (Revelation) is meant the Vedas and by Smriti (tradition) the Institutes of the sacred law; those two must not be called into question in any matter, since from those two the sacred law shone forth.

II. 11. Every twice-born man, who, relying on the Institutes of dialectics, treats with contempt those two sources (of the law), must be cast out by the virtuous as an atheist and a scorner of the Veda.

II. 12. The Veda, the sacred tradition, the customs of virtuous men, and one's own pleasure, they declare to be visibly the fourfold means of defining the sacred law."

The reasons for this are made manifest by Manu who says:

II. 6. "The whole Veda is the (first) source of the sacred law, next the tradition and the virtuous conduct of those who know the (Veda further) also the customs of holy men, and (finally) self-satisfaction:

II. 7. Whatever law has been ordained for any (person) by Manu; that has been fully declared in the Veda; for that (sage was) omniscient."

In this freedom there is not freedom for dialecticians, no freedom for logicians to criticise the social order which means there is no freedom at all.

What about liberty of action? In the sense of effective choice, there is no room for it in the Hindu social order. The Hindu social order leaves no choice to the individual. It fixes his occupation. It fixes his status. All that remains for the individual to do is to conform himself to these regulations.

The same must be said with regard to political liberty. The Hindu social order does not recognise the necessity of a representative government composed of the representatives chosen by the people. Representative Government rests on the belief that people must be governed by law and law can be made only by the representative of the people. The Hindu social order recognises the first part of this thesis which says that people must be governed by law. But it denies the second part of the thesis which says that law can be made only by the representatives chosen by the people. The tenets of the Hindu social order is that the law by which people are to be governed is already made and is to be found in the Vedas. Nobody has a right to add to and subtract from it. That being so, a representative assembly of the people is unnecessary. Political liberty which is liberty to frame laws and to make and unmake Government is futility for which there is no place in the Hindu social order.

To sum up, the Hindu social order is an order based on classes and not on individual. It is an order in which classes are graded one above the other. It is an order in which the status and functions of the classes are determined and fixed. The Hindu social order is a rigid order. No matter what changes take place in the relative position of an individual his social status as a member of the class he is born in relation to another person belonging to another class shall in no way be affected. The first shall never become the last. The last shall never become the first.

## The Hindu Social Order: Its Unique Features

So far the discussions were confined to describing the essentials of the Hindu social order. Besides its essentials, the Hindu social order has some unique features. These unique features are as important as the essentials. No study of the Hindu social order which does not make any reference to them can be regraded as complete or accurate.

What are these special features? The special features of the Hindu social order are three in number. Of these three, the most striking is the worship of the superman. In this respect the Hindu social order is nothing but Nietzsche's Gospel put in action. Nietzsche himself never claimed any originality for his theory of the superman. He admitted and avowed that he borrowed it from the Manu Smriti. In his treatise, called *Anti-Christ* this is what Nietzsche said :—

“After all, the question is, to what end are falsehoods perpetrated? The fact that, in Christianity, ‘Holy’ ends are entirely absent, constitutes my objection to the means it employs. Its ends are only bad ends; the poisoning, the calumination and the denial of life, the contempt of the body, the degradation and self-pollution of man by virtue of the contempt of sin,—consequently its means are bad as well. My feelings are quite the reverse when I read the law book of Manu, an incomparably intellectual and superior work, which it would be a sin against the spirit even to mention in the same breath with the Bible. You will guess immediately why it has a genuine philosophy behind it. In it, not merely an evil smelling Jewish distillation of Rabbinism and superstition—it gives something to chew even to the most fastidious psychologist. And, not to forget the most important point of all, it is fundamentally different from the very kind of Bible; by means of it the noble classes, the philosophers and the warriors guard and guide the masses; it is replete with noble values, it is filled with a feeling of



perfection with saying yea to life, triumphant sense of well-being in regard to itself and to life,—the Sun shines upon the whole book. All those things which Christianity smothers with its bottomless vulgarity; procreation, women, marriage are here treated with earnestness, with reverence, with love and confidence. How can one possibly place in the hands of children and women, a book that contains those vile words; ‘to avoid fornication let every man have his wife, let every woman have her own husband. . . . It is better to marry than to burn. And is it decent to be a Christian so long as the very origin of man is Christianised—that is to say, befouled, by the idea of the immaculate conception.’”

Nietzsche never got any respectful or serious hearing in his own country. In his own words, he was ‘sometimes defied as the philosopher of the aristocracy and squiarchy, sometimes hooted at, sometimes pitied and sometimes boycotted as an inhuman being.’ Nietzsche’s philosophy had become identified with will to power, will to violence and denial of spiritual values, sacrifice, servility to and debasement of the common man in the interest of the Superman. His philosophy with these high spots had created a feeling of loathsomeness and horror in the minds of the people of his own generation. He was utterly neglected if not shunned and Nietzsche himself took comfort by placing himself among the ‘posthumous men’. He foresaw for himself a remote public, centuries after his own time to appreciate him. Here too Nietzsche was destined to be disappointed. Instead of there being any appreciation of his philosophy the lapse of time has only augmented the horror and loathing which people of his generation felt for Nietzsche. Having regard to the vile nature of Nietzsche’s philosophy some people may not be ready to believe that the Hindu social order is based on the worship of the Superman.

Let the Manu Smriti speak on this point. This is what Manu says with regard to the position of the Brahmin in the Hindu social order.

I. 93. “As the Brahmana sprang from Prajapati’s (i.e. God’s) mouth, as he was first-born, and as he possesses the Veda, he is by right the Lord of this whole creation.”

I. 94. “For the self-existent (Swayambhu) i.e. God having performed austerities, produced him first from his own mouth, in order that the offerings might be conveyed to the Gods and Manes and that this universe might be preserved.”

I. 95. “What created being can surpass him, through whose mouth the Gods continually consume the sacrificial viands and the Manes the offerings to the dead.”

I. 96. "Of created beings the most excellent are said to be those which are animated, of the animated those who subsist by intelligence; of the intelligent mankind, and of the men the Brahmins."

Besides the reason given by Manu the Brahman is first in rank because he was produced by God from his mouth, in order that the offerings might be conveyed to the Gods and manes, Manu gives another reason for the supremacy of the Brahman. He says:

I. 98. "The very birth of a Brahmana is an eternal incarnation of the sacred law (Veda) for he is born to (fulfil) the sacred law, and becomes one with Brahman (God.)"

I. 99. "A Brahmana coming into existence, is born as the highest on earth, the Lord of all created beings, for the protection of the treasury of the law."

Manu concludes by saying that:

I. 101. "The Brahmana eats but his own food, wears but his own apparel, bestows but his own in alms; other mortals subsist through the benevolence of the Brahmana."

Because according to Manu:

I. 100. "Whatever exists in the world is the property of the Brahmana; on account of the excellence of his origin the Brahmana is, indeed, entitled to it all."

Being a deity the Brahman is above law and above the king. Manu directs:

VII. 37. "Let the king, rising early in the morning, worship Brahmanas who are well-versed in the threefold sacred science and learned (in polity) and follow their advice."

VII. 38. "Let him daily worship aged Brahmins who know the Veda and are pure....."

Finally Manu says:

XI. 35. "The Brahman is (hereby) declared to be the creator (of the world), the punisher, the teacher, (and hence) a benefactor (of all created beings) to him let no man say anything unpropitious, nor use any harsh words."

Manu ordains that:

X. 3. "From priority of birth, from superiority of origin, from a more exact knowledge of scripture, and from a distinction in the sacrificial thread, the Brahman is the lord of all classes."

The Brahmin or the Superman of the Hindu social order was entitled to certain privileges. In the first place, he could not be hanged even though he might be guilty of murder.<sup>1</sup> Manu says:

<sup>1</sup> This immunity was continued by the British Government up to 1837. It was in 1837 the Penal Law was amended whereby the Brahman for the first time became liable to capital punishment for murder. The immunity still exists in Indian States. In Travancore the Dewan who is a Brahmin adopted an ingenious method of meeting public criticism of this continuance of this privilege. Instead of hanging the Brahmins he abolished capital punishment altogether.

VIII. 379. "Ignominious tonsure is ordained, instead of capital punishment, for a Brahmin adulterer where the punishment of other classes may extend to loss of life."

VIII. 380. "Never shall the king slay a Brahmin, though convicted of all possible crimes; let him banish the offender from his realm, but with all his property secure, and his body unhurt."

XI. 127. "For a Brahmin killing intentionally a virtuous man of the Kshatriya class, the penance must be a fourth part of that ordained for killing a priest; for killing a Vaishya, only an eighth; for killing a Shudra, who had been constant in discharging his duties a sixteenth part."

XI. 128. "But, if a Brahmin kills a Kshatriya without malice, he must, after a full performance of his religious rites, give the priests one bull together with a thousand cows."

XI. 129. "Or he may perform for three years the penance for slaying a Brahmin, mortifying his organs of sensation and action, letting his hair grow long, and living remote from the town, with the root of a tree for his mansion."

XI. 130. "If he kills without malice a Vaishya, who had a good moral character, he may perform the same penance for one year, or give the priests a hundred cows and a bull."

XI. 131. "For six months must he perform this whole penance, if without intention he kills a Shudra, or he may give ten white cows and a bull to the priests."

VIII. 381. "No greater crime is known on earth than slaying a Brahmin; and the king, therefore must not even form in his mind an idea of killing a priest."

VIII. 126. "Let the king having considered and ascertained the frequency of a similar offence, the place and time, the ability of the criminal to pay or suffer and the crime itself, cause punishment to fall on those alone, who deserve it."

VIII. 124. "Manu, son of the self-existent, has named ten places of punishment, which are appropriated to the three lower classes, but a Brahmin must depart from the realm unhurt in any one of them."

The Brahmin has been given by the Manu Smriti other privileges. In the matter of marriage in addition to his marrying a woman of his own class he is entitled<sup>1</sup> to enter into wedlock with a woman of any of the classes lower to him without being bound to the woman by the tie of marriage or conferring upon the children the right to his status or to his property. He had the

<sup>1</sup> Manu III. 12-13- This privilege is recognised by Courts in India.

power to punish his wrongdoer without resort to court<sup>1</sup>. He could take the property of the common man (the Shudra) without compensation and without reference to court if the same was necessary for the performance of his religious duties<sup>2</sup>. If he discovers a hidden treasure he was free to appropriate the whole<sup>3</sup> of it without giving the usual share to the king 'since he was the lord of all' and was entitled to claim half<sup>4</sup> if it was discovered by another. He was entitled to whole amount accumulated from legal fines from a king whose death was due to some incurable disease.<sup>5</sup> He was exempt from taxation<sup>6</sup>. He was entitled to compel the king to provide for his daily food and to see that he did not starve<sup>7</sup>. His property was free from the law of escheat.<sup>8</sup>

The superman of the Hindu Social order is not bound by the rules as to occupation if he is in distress.

Manu says:—

X. 81. "Yet a Brahman, unable to subsist by his duties just mentioned, may live by the duty of a soldier; for that is the next in rank."

X. 82. "If it be asked, how he must live, should he be unable to get a subsistence by either of those employments; the answer is, he may subsist as a mercantile man, applying himself in person to tillage and attendance on cattle."

X. 83. "But a Brahman and a Kshatriya, obliged to subsist by the acts of a Vaishya, must avoid with care, if they can live by keeping herds, the business of tillage, which gives great pain to sentient creatures, and is dependent on the labour of others, as bulls and so forth."

X. 84. "Some are of opinion, that agriculture is excellent but it is a mode of subsistence which the benevolent greatly blame, for the iron mouthed pieces of wood not only wound the earth, but the creatures dwelling in it."

X. 85. "If, through want of a virtuous livelihood, they cannot follow laudable occupations, they may then gain a competence of wealth by selling commodities usually sold by merchants, avoiding what ought to be avoided."

X. 102. "The Brahmana, having fallen into distress, may receive gifts from any person whatever; for by no sacred rule can it be shown, that absolute purity can be sullied."

<sup>1</sup> Manu XI. 31.—This privilege has been abolished.

<sup>2</sup> Manu XI. 32.—This privilege no longer exists.

<sup>3</sup> Manu VIII. 37.

<sup>4</sup> Manu VIII. 38.

<sup>5</sup> Manu IX. 323.

<sup>6</sup> Manu VII. 133.

<sup>7</sup> Manu VII. 134.

X. 103. "From interpreting the Veda, from officiating at sacrifices or from taking presents, though in modes generally disapproved, no sin is committed by priests in distress; for they are as pure as fire or water."

The privileges of the superman are not at all counterbalanced by an obligation towards the common man. Indeed the superman has no duty towards the common man.

He is not bound to do charity for the uplift of the Common man. On the other hand, to receive charity is the monopoly of the Superman. For any other person to receive charity is a sin. To the Common man (Shudra) who is born to serve the Superman man, the Superman is not at all required to be a good employer and is not bound to keep him well-fed, well clothed and well-housed. His obligations in this behalf as laid down by Manu are stated below:

X. 124. "They must allot to him (Shudra) out of their own family property a suitable maintenance after considering his ability, his industry and the number of those whom he is bound to support."

X. 125. "The remnants of their food must be given to him, as well as their old clothes, the refuse of their grain, and their old household furniture."

The rise of the Common man is antagonistic to the supremacy of the Superman. In order to keep the Superman satisfied, happy and secure the Hindu social order takes special care to keep the Common man in a state of perpetual degradation.

Manu insists on the Shudra doing nothing but service:

X. 122. "But let a Shudra serve Brahmanas."

X. 121. "If a Shudra unable to subsist by serving Brahmanas seeks a livelihood, he may serve Kshatriyas, or he may also seek to maintain himself by attending on a wealthy Vaishya."

I. 91. "One occupation only the lord prescribed to the Shudra, to serve meekly even these other three castes."

And why? Manu does not hesitate to give the reason. He says:

X. 129. "No superfluous collection of wealth must be made by a Shudra, even though he has power to make it, since a servile man, who has amassed riches, becomes proud, and, by his insolence or neglect, gives pain even to Brahmanas."

The common man is not permitted to acquire learning. The following are the injunctions of Manu:

I. 88. "To the Brahmanas he (the creator) assigned *teaching* and *studying* the Veda."

I. 89. "The Kshatriya he (the creator) commanded to *study* the Veda."

II. 116. "He who shall acquire knowledge of the Veda without the assent of his preceptor incurs the guilt of stealing the scripture, and shall sink to the region of torment."

IV. 99. "He (the twice-born) must never read the Veda.... in the presence of the Shudras."

IX. 18. "Women have no business with the text of the Veda."

IX. 199. "A twice-born man who has.... (improperly) divulged the Veda (ie., to Shudras and women) commits sin, atones for his offence, if he subsists a year on barley."

In those texts there are embodied three distinct propositions. The Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas can study the Vedas. Of these the Brahmins alone have the right to teach the Vedas. But in the case of the Shudra he has not only to study the Vedas but he should not be allowed to hear it read.

The successors of Manu made the disability of the Shudra in the matter of the study of the Veda into an offence involving dire penalties. For instance, Gautama says:

III. 4. "If the Shudra intentionally listens for committing to memory the Veda, then his ears should be filled with (molten) lead and lac; if he utters the Veda, then his tongue should be cut off; if he has mastered the Veda his body should be cut to pieces."

To the same effect is Katyayana.

The common man (Shudra) is not allowed the benefit of the sacrament of initiation. It is the second birth that helps towards the moral and material advancement of the individual.

The common man is denied the right to have a name conveying dignity. Manu says:

II. 30. "Let the father perform or cause to be performed the Namadheya (the rite of name of the child), on the tenth or twelfth (day after birth), or on a lucky lunar day in a lucky muhurth under an auspicious constellation.

II. 31. "Let (the first part of) a Brahman's name (denote something) auspicious, a Kshatriya name be connected with power, and a Vaishya with wealth, but a Shudra's (express something) contemptible."

II. 32. "(The second part of) a Brahman's name shall be a word implying happiness, of a Kshatriya (a word) implying protection, of a Vaishya (a term) expressive of thriving and of a Shudra's (an expression) denoting a service."

The Superman will not tolerate the Shudra to have the comfort of a high-sounding name. He must be contemptible both in fact and in name.

A Hindu's life is divided into periods. The first period is called Brahmacharya, the stage of a student. The second period is called Grahasthashram, the stage of married life. The third period is called Vanasprastha, the stage of detachment from worldly life. The fourth period is called Sanyasa which is complete severance from the affairs of the world which is tantamount to civil death. The common man is denied the right of becoming a Sanyasi. It is difficult to understand why. Obviously for the benefit of the Superman. A Shudra by becoming a Sanyasi ceases to render service to Superman. A Shudra by becoming a Sanyasi reaches God or Brahma which is an invasion of the privileges of the Superman.

The citations from Manu prove that the Hindu social order is openly and avowedly devised and intended for the good of the Superman. In it everything is ordained for the Superman. The Superman is the Brahmin and the common man is the Shudra. The Superman has rights and no duties. Everything is at the disposal of the Superman, everything must be ascribed in the interests of the Superman. The counterpart of the same feature is the degradation of the common man. As against the Superman the common man has no right to life, liberty, property or pursuit of happiness. He must be ready to sacrifice everything for the sustenance of the life and dignity of the Superman. The Hindu social order prescribes that such sacrifice should be made willingly by the common man. Indeed, it inculcates that the common man should respond to such call for sacrifice in the interest of the Superman as his supreme duty.

Can there be any doubt that Zarathustra is a new name for Manu and that 'Thus spake Zarathustra' is a new edition of the Manu Smriti?

If there is any difference between Manu and Nietzsche, it lies in this. Nietzsche was genuinely interested in creating a new race of men which will be race of Superman as compared with the existing race of men. Manu, on the other hand, was interested in maintaining the privilege of a class who had come to arrogate to itself the claim of being Superman. Nietzsche's Supermen were Supermen by reason of their worth. Nietzsche was a genuine disinterested philosopher. Manu, on the contrary, was a hireling engaged to propound a philosophy which served the interests of a class, born in a group and whose title to being Superman was not to be lost even if they lost their virtue. Compare the following texts from Manu.<sup>1</sup>

X. 81. "Yet, a Brahmin, unable to subsist by his duties just mentioned, may live by the duty of a soldier; for that is the next rank."

<sup>1</sup> The correct description of the Brahmin would be the Supermost Superman. For below him and above the common man there are the Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas. But since the Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas are only superiors and not supermen it is unnecessary to change the nomenclature.

X. 82. "If it be asked, how he must live, should he be unable to get a subsistence by either of those employments; the answer is, he may subsist as a mercantile man, applying himself to tillage and an attendance on cattle."

Manu adds:

IX. 317. "A Brahmin, be he ignorant or learned, is a great divinity, just as the fire, whether carried forth (for the performance of a burnt oblation) or not carried forth, is a great divinity."

IX. 319. "Thus, though the Brahmins employ themselves in all (sorts) of mean occupation, they must be honoured in every way; (for each of) them is a very great deity."

Nietzsche's praise of the Manu Smriti is undeserved. For when he says that according to its scheme "the noble classes, the philosophers and the warriors guard and guide the masses", he is either making a positively untrue statement or that he has not read it correctly. Under the Manu Smriti the superman has rights against the common man but he has no duties towards the common man.

Manu's degraded and degenerate philosophy of Superman as compared with that of Nietzsche is therefore far more odious and loathsome than the philosophy of Nietzsche. Such is the social order which the Hindus regard as a pearl without price and which Mr. Gandhi is proud to offer as a gift from the Hindus to the world.

Another special feature of the Hindu social order relates to the technique devised for its preservation. The technique is twofold.

The first technique is to place the responsibility of upholding and maintaining the social order upon the shoulders of the King. Manu does this in quite express terms.

VIII. 410. "The King should order each man of the mercantile class to practise trade or money-lending or agriculture and attendance on cattle; and each man of the servile class to act in the service of the twice-born."

VIII. 418. "With vigilant care should the King exert himself in compelling merchants and mechanics to perform their respective duties; for, when such men swerve from their duty they throw this world into confusion."

Manu does not stop with the mere enunciation of the duty of the King in this behalf. He wants to ensure that the King shall at all times perform his duty to maintain and preserve the established order. Manu therefore makes two further provisions. One provision is to make the failure of the King to maintain the established order an offence for which the King became liable for prosecution and punishment like



a common felon. This would be clear from the following citations from Manu :—

VIII. 335. “Neither a father, nor a preceptor, nor a friend, nor a mother, nor a wife, nor a son, nor a domestic priest must be left unpunished by the King if they adhere not with firmness to their duty.”

VIII. 336. “Where another man of lower birth would be fined one pana, the King shall be fined a thousand, and he shall give the fine to the priests, or cast it into the river, this is a sacred rule.”

The other provision made by Manu against a King who is either negligent or opposed to the established order is to invest the three classes, Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas with a right to rise in armed rebellion against the King.

VIII. 348. “The twice-born may take arms, when their duty is obstructed by force; and when, in some evil time, a disaster has befallen the twice-born classes.”

The Right of rebellion is given to the three higher classes and not to the Shudra. This is very natural. Because it is only the three upper classes who would benefit by the maintenance of this system. But supposing the Kshatriyas joined the king in destroying the system what is to be done? Manu gives the authority to the Brahmins to punish all and particularly the Kshatriyas.

XI. 31. “A priest, who well knows the laws, need not complain to the king of any grievous injury; since, even by his own power, he may chastise those, who injure him.”

XI. 32. “His own power, which depends on himself alone, is mightier than the royal power, which depends on other men; by his own might, therefore, may a Brahmin coerce his foes.”

XI. 33. “He may use, without hesitation, the powerful charms revealed to Atharvan, and by him to Angiras; for speech is the weapon of a Brahmin; with that he may destroy his oppressors.”

IX. 320. “Of a military man, who raises his arm violently on all occasions against the priestly class, the priest himself shall be the chastiser; since the soldier originally proceeded from the Brahmin.”

How can the Brahmins punish the Kshatriyas unless they can take arms? Manu knows this and therefore allows the Brahmins to arm themselves to punish the Kshatriyas.

XII. 100. “Command of armies, royal authority, power of inflicting punishment, and sovereign dominion over all nations, he only well deserves, who perfectly understands the Veda Sastra i.e., who is a Brahmin.”

The second technique devised for the maintenance and preservation of the established order is quite different from the first. Really speaking, it is this which constitutes a special feature of the Hindu social order.

In the wake of the preservation of the social order from violent attack it is necessary to bear in mind three considerations. The outbreak of a revolution is conditioned by three factors: (1) the existence of a sense of wrong; (2) capacity to know that one is suffering from a wrong and (3) availability of arms. The second consideration is that there are two ways of dealing with a rebellion. One is to prevent a rebellion from occurring and the other is to suppress it after it has broken out. The third consideration is that whether the prevention of rebellion would be feasible or whether the suppression of rebellion would be the only method open, would depend upon the rules which govern the three pre-requisites of rebellion.

When the social order denies opportunity to rise, denies right to education and denies right to use arms, it is in a position to prevent rebellion against the social order. Where on the other hand, a social order allows right to education, and permits the use of arms, it cannot prevent rebellion by those who suffer wrongs. Its only remedy to preserve the social order is by suppression of rebellion by the use of force and violence. The Hindu social order has adopted the first method. It has fixed the social status of the lower orders for all generations to come. Their economic status is also fixed. There being no disparity between the two, there is no possibility of a grievance growing up. It has denied education to the lower orders. The result is that no one is conscious that his low condition is a ground for grievance. If there is any consciousness it is that no one is responsible for the low condition. It is the result of fate. Assuming there is a grievance, assuming there is consciousness of grievance, there cannot be a rebellion by the lower orders against the Hindu social order because the Hindu social order denies the masses the right to use arms. Other social orders such as those of the Muslims or the Nazis, follow the opposite course. They allow equal opportunity to all. They allow freedom to acquire knowledge. They allow the right to bear arms and take upon themselves the odium of suppressing rebellion by force and violence. To deny freedom of opportunity, to deny freedom to acquire knowledge, to deny the right of arms is a most cruel wrong. Its results Manu mutilates and emasculates man. The Hindu social order is not ashamed to do this. It has, however, achieved two things. It has found the most effective, even though it be the most shameless method of preserving the established order. Secondly, notwithstanding the use of

most inhuman means of killing manliness, it has given to the Hindus the reputation of being very humane people. The Nazis had indeed a great deal to learn from the Hindus. If they had adopted the technique of suppressing the masses devised by the Hindus they would have been able to crush the Jews without open cruelty and would have also exhibited themselves as humane masters.

The third special feature of the Hindu social order is that it is a Divine order designed by God himself. As such it is sacred, not open to abrogation, amendment, not even to criticism. For the purpose of removing any doubt that may be lurking in the minds of anybody about the Divine character of the Hindu social order, attention is invited to the following verses from the Bhagvat Gita and the Manu Smriti. Shri Krishna one of the Hindu Gods, whose word is the Bhagvat Gita says:—

IV. 13. "I myself have created the arrangement of the four castes (into Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras), consistently with the differences in their qualities and actions. It is, I who am the Maker of it."

XVIII. 41-44. "O, Parantapa! the respective duties of Brahmins (priests), Kshatriyas (warriors), Vaishyas (tradesmen) and Shudras (menials) have been individually fixed with reference to the qualities arising from their inherent natures, that is, from Prakriti. The inherently natural duties of a Brahmin are peace, self-restraint, religious austerities, cleanliness, quietness, straightforwardness (humanity). Knowledge (that is, spiritual knowledge), Vijnana (that is Imperial knowledge) and *Astikya-budhi* (that is belief in a future world). The inherently natural duty (karma) of the Kshatriya is bravery, brilliance, courage, intentness, not running away from the battle, generosity, and exercising authority (over subject people) '*goraksya*' (that is the business of keeping cattle), and *vanijya* (that is, trade) is the inherently natural duty of the Vaishya; and in the same way, *service* is the inherently natural duty of the Shudra."

Krishna forbids propaganda against the Hindu social order. He says:—

III. 26. "As the ignorant act with attachment to action so a wise man wishing to keep the people to their duties, should not shake the convictions of the ignorant who are attached to action, but acting with devotion (himself) should make them apply themselves to all action.... A man of perfect knowledge should not shake these men of imperfect knowledge in their convictions."

When the Hindu social order breaks down, Krishna does not want the people to undertake the work of reform. He asks them to leave the

task to him. This is evident from the following admonition contained in the Bhagvat Gita. Says Krishna :—

IV. 7-8. “O! Bharata, whenever Righteousness declines and Unrighteousness becomes powerful, then I Myself come to birth. I take birth in different Yugas for protecting the Righteous and destroying the Unrighteous and for establishing Righteousness.”

It is not only a special feature of the Hindu social order. It is an extraordinary feature. An examination of consecrations will show that there are instances where society has consecrated inanimate beings and inculcated on the minds of its members the religious belief that they are sacred. There are cases where stones, rivers, trees are made Gods and Goddesses. There are instances where society has consecrated living things and inculcated on the minds of its members the religious belief that they are sacred. But there are no instances where a particular social order has been consecrated by Religion and made sacred. The primitive world had its clan order and its tribal order. But the clan or the tribal order was only a social order and was never consecrated by religion and made sacred and inviolate. The ancient world countries like Egypt, Persia, Rome, Greece, etc., each had its social order in which some were free and some were slaves, some were citizens, some were aliens, some of the race, some of another. This class order again was only a social order and was never consecrated by religion and made sacred and inviolate. The modern world has its order, in some it is Democracy, in some Facism, in some Nazism and in some Bolshevism. But here again the order is only social order. It is not consecrated by religion and made sacred and inviolate.

Nowhere has society consecrated its occupations—the ways of getting a living. Economic activity has always remained outside the sanctity of religion. Hunting society was not without a religion. But Hunting as an occupation was not consecrated by religion and made sacred. Pastoral society was not without religion. But pastorage was not consecrated by religion and made sacred. Farming as an occupation did not become consecrated by religion and made sacred. Feudalism with its gradations, with its Lords, villains and serfs was a purely social in character. There was nothing sacred about it.

The Hindus are the only people in the world whose social order—the relation of man to man is consecrated by religion and made sacred, eternal and inviolate. The Hindus are the only people in the world whose economic order—the relation of workman to workman, is consecrated by religion and made sacred, eternal and inviolate.

It is not therefore enough to say that the Hindus are a people with a sacred code of religion. So are the Zorastrians, Israelites, Christians

and Muslims. All these have sacred codes. They consecrate beliefs and rites and make them sacred. But they do not prescribe, nor do they consecrate a particular form of social structure—the relationship between man and man in a concrete form—and make it sacred inviolate. The Hindus are singular in this respect. This is what has given the Hindu social order its abiding strength to defy the ravages of time and the onslaught of time.

The orthodox Hindu will accept this as an accurate description of the Hindu social order. It is only the reformer who is likely to demur. He would say that since the advent of the British, this is all a description of a dead past. One need not be perturbed by this view. For it contains a fallacy. It omits to take note of the fact that institutions which have died as creeds sometimes continue, nevertheless survive as habits. No one can deny that the Hindu social order has become the habit of the Hindus and as such is in full force.

□ □

## CHAPTER 4

### Symbols of Hinduism

*There are 37 pages under this title. The chapter seems incomplete. However this relates to the topic No. 7 of the original plan. All these pages are tagged along with the pages of "India and Communism" into One register. We are reproducing the text of this typed copy along with the table of contents written by Dr. Ambedkar.*

*A photo copy of the plan of a proposed book 'Can I be a Hindu?' is also reproduced from the original (moth-eaten).—Editors*

Is there anything peculiar in the social organization of the Hindus? An unsophisticated Hindu who is unaware of investigations conducted by scholars will say that there is nothing peculiar, abnormal or unnatural in the organization of the Hindu society. This is quite natural. People who live their lives in isolation are seldom conscious of the peculiarities of their ways and manners. People have gone on from generation to generation without stopping to give themselves a name. But how does the social organization of the Hindus strike the outsiders, the non-Hindus? Did it appear to them as normal and natural as it appears to the Hindus?

Megasthenese who came to India as the ambassador of the Greek King Seleukos Nicator to the Court of Chandragupta Maurya some time about the year 305 B.C. did feel that the social organization of the Hindus was of a very strange sort. Otherwise, he would not have taken such particular care to describe the peculiar features of the Hindu social organization. He has recorded :

“The population of India is divided into seven parts. The philosophers are first in rank, but form the smallest class in point of

number. Their services are employed privately by persons who wish to offer sacrifices or perform other sacred rites, and also publicly by the kings at what is called the Great Synod, wherein at the beginning of the new year all the philosophers are gathered together before the king at the gates, when any philosopher who may have committed any useful suggestion to writing, or observed any means for improving the crops and the cattle, or for promoting the public interests, declares it publicly. If anyone is detected giving false information thrice, the law condemns him to be silent for the rest of his life, but he who gives sound advice is exempted from paying any taxes or contributions. The second caste consists of the husbandmen, who form the bulk of the population, and are in disposition most mild and gentle. They are exempted from military service, and cultivate their lands undisturbed by fear. They never go to town, either to take part in its tumults, or for any other purpose. It therefore not unfrequently happens that at the same time, and in the same part of the country, men may be seen drawn up in array of battle, and fighting at risk of their lives, while other men close at hand are ploughing and digging in perfect security, having these soldiers to protect them. The whole of the land is the property of the king, and the husbandmen till it on condition of receiving one-fourth of the produce.

The third caste consists of herdsmen and hunters, who alone are allowed to hunt, and to keep cattle and to sell draught animals or let them out on hire. In return for clearing the land of wild beasts and fowls which devour the seeds sown in the fields, they receive an allowance of grain from the king. They lead wandering life and live under tents.

The fourth class, after herdsmen and hunters, consists of those who work at trades, of those who vend wares, and of those who are employed in bodily labour. Some of these pay tribute, and render to the state certain prescribed services. But the armourmakers and shipbuilders receive wages and their victuals from the king, for whom alone they work. The general in command of the army supplies the soldiers with weapons, and the admiral of the fleet lets out ships on hire for the transport both of passengers and merchandise.

The fifth class consists of fighting men, who when not engaged in active service, pass their time in idleness and drinking. They are maintained at the king's expense, and hence they are always ready, when occasion calls, to take the field, for they carry nothing of their own with them but their own bodies.

The sixth class consists of the overseers, to whom is assigned the duty of watching all that goes on, and making reports secretly to the king. Some are entrusted with the inspection of the city, and others with that of the army. The former employ as their coadjutors the courtezans of the city, and the latter the courtezans of the camp. The ablest and most trustworthy men are appointed to fill these offices.

The seventh class consists of the Councillors and assessors of the king. To them belong the highest posts of government, the tribunals of justice, and the general administration of public affairs.

No one is allowed to marry out of his own caste, or to exchange one profession or trade for another, or to follow more than one business. An exception is made in favour of the philosopher, who for his virtue is allowed this privilege."

Alberuni who wrote an account of his travels in India some time about 1030 AD must have been struck by the peculiarity of the Hindu social organization. For he too has not omitted to make a note of it in the record of impressions he made. He observed :—

"The Hindus call their castes varna i.e. colours, and from a genealogical point of view they call them jataka i.e., births. These castes are from the very beginning only four.

I. The highest caste are the Brahmins of whom the books of the Hindus tell that they were created from the head of Brahma. And a Brahma is only another name for the force called nature, and the head is the highest part of the animal body, the Brahmana are the choice part of the whole genus. Therefore the Hindus consider them as the very best of mankind.

II. The next caste are the Kshatriyas, who were created, as they say, from the shoulders and hands of Brahma. Their degree is not much below that of the Brahmana.

III. After them follow the Vaisyas, who were created from the thigh of Brahma.

IV. The Sudras, who were created from his feet.

Between the latter two classes there is no very great distance. Much, however, as these classes differ from each other, they live together in the same towns and villages, mixed together in the same houses and lodgings.

After the Sudra follow the people called Antyaja, who render various kinds of services, who are not reckoned amongst any caste, but only as members of a certain craft or profession. There are eight classes of them who freely intermarry with each other, except the fuller, shoemaker and weaver, for no others would condescend to



have anything to do with them. These eight guilds are the fuller, shoemaker, juggler, the basket and shield maker, the sailor, fisherman, the hunter of wild animals and of birds, and the weaver. The four castes do not live together with them in one and the same place. These guilds live near the villages and towns of the four castes, but outside them.

The people called Hadi, Doma (Domba), Candala, and Badhatau (sic) are not reckoned amongst any caste or guild. They are occupied with dirty work, like the cleansing of the villages and other services. They are considered as one sole class, and distinguished only by their occupations. In fact, they are considered like illegitimate children; for according to general opinion they descend from a Sudra father and a Brahmani mother as the children of fornication; therefore they are degraded outcaste.

The Hindus give to every single man of the four castes characteristic names, according to their occupations and modes of life, eg., the Brahman is in general called by this name as long as he does his work staying at home. When he is busy with the service of one fire, he is called *ishtin*; if he serves three fires, he is called *Agnihotrin*; if he besides offers an offering to the fire, he is called *Dikshita*. And as it is with the Brahmana, so is it also with the other castes. Of the classes beneath the castes, the Hadi are the best spoken of, because they keep themselves free from everything unclean. Next follow the Doma, who play on the lute and sing. The still lower classes practise as a trade killing and the inflicting of judicial punishments. The worst of all are the Badhantan, who not only devour the flesh of dead animals, but even of dogs and other beasts.

Each of the four castes, when eating together, must form a group of themselves, one group not being allowed to comprise two men of different castes. If, further, in the group of the Brahman there are two men who live at enmity with each other, and the seat of the one is by the side of the other, they make a barrier between the two seats by placing a board between them, or by spreading a piece of dress, or in some other way; and if there is only a line drawn between them, they are considered as separated. Since it is forbidden to eat the remains of a meal, every single man must have his own food for himself, for if anyone of the party who are eating should take of the food from one and the same plate, that which remains in the plate becomes, after the first eater has taken part, to him who wants to take as the second, the remains of the meal as such is forbidden."

Alberuni did not merely content himself with recording what struck him as peculiar in the Hindu social organization. He went on to say:—

“Among the Hindus institutions of this kind abound. We Muslims, of course, stand entirely on the other side of the question, considering all men as equal, except in piety; and this is the greatest obstacle which prevents any approach or understanding between Hindus and Muslims.”

Duarte Barbosa who was a Portuguese official in the service of the Portuguese Government in India from 1500 to 1571 has left a record of his impressions of Hindu society. This is what struck him in. Speaking of the kingdom of Gujerat:

“And before this kingdom Guzerate fell into the hands of the Moors. A certain caste of Heathen whom the Moors called Resbutos (Rajputs) dwelt therein, who in those days were the knights and wardens of the land, and made war wheresoever it was needful. These men kill and eat sheep and fish and all other kinds of food; in the mountains there are yet many of the them, where they have great villages and obey not the king of Guzarate, but rather wage daily war against him; who, do what he may, is yet not able to prevail against them, nor will do so, for they are very fine horsemen, and good archers, and have besides divers other weapons to defend themselves withal against the Moors, on whom they make war without ceasing; yet have they no king nor lord over them. And in this kingdom there is another sort of Heathen whom they call Baneanes, who are great merchants and traders. They dwell among the Moors with whom they carry on all their trade. This people eat neither flesh nor fish nor anything subject to death; they slay nothing, nor are they willing even to see the slaughter of any animal; and thus they maintain their idolatry and hold it so firmly that it is a terrible thing. For often it is so that the Moors take to them live insects or small birds, and make as though to kill them in their presence, and the Baneanes buy these and ransom them, paying much more than they are worth, so that they may save their lives and let them go. And if the King or a Governor of the land has any man condemned to death, for any crime which he has committed, they gather themselves together and buy him from justice, if they are willing to sell him, that he may not die. And divers Moorish mendicants as well, when they wish to obtain alms from this people, take great stones wherewith they beat upon their shoulders and bellies as though they would slay themselves before them, to hinder which they give them great alms that they may depart in peace. Others carry knives with which they slash their arms and legs, and

to these too they give large alms that they may not kill themselves. Others go to their doors seeking to kill rats and snakes for them, and to them also they give much money that they may not do so. Thus they are much esteemed by the Moors. When these Baneanes meet with a swarm of ants on the road they shrink back and seek for some way to pass without crushing them. And in their houses they sup by daylight, for neither by night nor by day will they light a lamp, by reason of certain little flies which perish in the flame thereof; and if there is any great need of a light by night they have a lantern of varnished paper or cloth, so that no living thing may find its way in, and die in the flame. And if these men breed many lice they kill them not, but when they trouble them too much they send for certain men, also Heathen, who living among them and whom they hold to be men of a holy life, they are like hermits living with great abstinence through devotion to their gods. These men house them, and as many lice as they catch they place on their own heads and breed them on their own flesh, by which they say they do great service to their Idol. Thus one and all they maintain with great self restraint their law of not killing. On the other hand they are great usurers, falsifiers of weights and measures and many other goods and of coins; and great liars. These Heathen are tawny men, tall and well-looking gaily attired, delicate and moderate in their food. Their diet is of milk, butter, sugar and rice, and many conserves of divers sorts. They make much use of dishes of fruit and vegetables and pot herbs in their food. Wheresoever they dwell they have orchards and fruit gardens and many water tanks wherein they bathe twice a day, both men and women; and they say when they have finished bathing that they are clear of as many sins as they have committed up to that hour. These Baneanes grow very long hair, as women do with us, and wear it twisted up on the head and made into a knot, and over it a turban, that they may keep it always held together; and in their hair they put flowers and other sweet scented things.

They use to annoint themselves with white sandalwood mixed with saffron and other scents. They are very amorous people. They are clad in long cotton and silken shirts and are shod with pointed shoes of richly wrought cordwain; some of them wear short coats of silk and brocade. They carry no arms except certain very small knives ornamented with gold and silver, and this for two reasons; first because they are men who make but little use of weapons; and secondly, because the Moors defend them."

And there is here another class of Heathen whom they call Brahmenes, who are priests among them and persons who manage

and rule their houses of prayer and idol-worship, which are of great size and have great revenues; and many of them also are maintained by alms. In these houses are great numbers of wooden Idols, and others of stone and copper and in these houses or monasteries they celebrate great ceremonies in honour of these idols, entertaining them with great store of candles and oil lamps, and with bells after our fashion. These Brahmans and Heathen have in their creed many resemblances to the Holy Trinity, and hold in great honour the relation of the Triune Three, and always make their prayers to God, whom they confess and adore as the true God, Creator and maker of all things, who is three persons and one God, and they say that there are many other Gods who are rulers under him, in whom also they believe. These Brahmans and Heathen wheresoever they find our churches enter them and make prayers and adorations to our Images, always asking for Santa Maria, like men who have some knowledge and understanding of these matters and they honour the Church as is our manner, saying that between them and us there is little difference. These men never eat anything subject to death, nor do they slay anything. Bathing they hold to be a great ceremony and they say that by it they are saved."

Speaking of the Kingdom of Calicut, Barbosa says:—

"There is also in this same kingdom of Calicut a caste of people called Brahmenes who are priests among them (as are the clergy among us) of whom I have spoken in another place."

"These all speak the same tongue, nor can any be a Brahmene except he be the son of a Brahmene. When they are seven years of age they put over their shoulder a strip of two fingers in breadth of untanned skin with the hair on it of a certain wild beast which they call Cryvamergam, which resembles a wild ass. Then for seven years he must not eat betel for which time he continues to wear this strap. When he is fourteen years old they make him a Brahmene, and taking off their leather strip they invest him with the cord of three strands which he wears for the rest of his life as a token that he is a Brahmene. And this they do with great ceremonial and rejoicings, as we do here for a cleric when he sings his first mass. Thereafter he may eat betel, but no flesh or fish. They have great honour among the Indians, and as I have already said, they suffer death for no cause whatsoever, their own headman gives them a mild chastisement. They marry once only in our manner, and only the eldest son marries, he is treated like the head of an entailed estate. The other brothers remain single all their lives. These Brahmenes keep their wives well guarded, and greatly honoured, so that no

other man may sleep with them; if any of them die, they do not marry again, but if a woman wrongs her husband she is slain by poison. The brothers who remain bachelors sleep with the Nayre women, they hold it to be a great honour, and as they are Brahmenes no woman refuses herself to them, yet they may not sleep with any woman older than themselves. They dwell in their own houses and cities, and serve as clergy in the houses of worship, whither they go to pray at certain hours of the day, performing their rituals and idolatries. ”

“ Some of these Brahmenes serve the kings in every manner except in arms. No man may prepare any food for the King except a Brahmene or his own kin; they also serve as couriers to other countries with letters, money or merchandise, passing wherever they wish to go in safety and none does them any ill, even when the kings are at war. These Brahmenes are learned in their idolatry and possess many books thereof. The Kings hold them in high esteem.”

“ I have already spoken many times of the Naiyars and yet I have not hitherto told you what manner of men they are. You are to know that in this land of Malabar there is another caste of people called Nayars and among them are noble men who have no other duty than to serve in war, and they always carry their arms withersoever they go, some swords and shields, others bows and arrows, and yet others spears. They all live with the King, and the other great Lords; nevertheless all receive stipends from the King or from the great Lords with whom they dwell. None may become a Nayar, save only he who is of Nayar lineage. They are very free from stain in their nobility. They will not touch anyone of low caste. Nor eat nor drink save in the house of a Nayar. These men are not married, their nephews (sister's sons) are their heirs. The Nayar women of good birth are very independent, and dispose of themselves as they please with Brahmenes and Nayars, but they do not sleep with men of caste lower than their own under pain of death. When they reach the age of twelve years their mothers hold a great ceremony. When a mother perceives that her daughter has attained that age, she asks her kinsfolk and friends to make ready to honour her daughter, then she asks of the kindred and especially of one particular kinsman or great friend to marry her daughter; this he willingly promises and then he has a small jewel made, which would contain a half ducat of gold, long like a ribbon, with a hole through the middle which comes out on the other side, strung on a thread of white silk. The mother then on a fixed day is present with her daughter gaily decked with many rich jewels, making great rejoicings with music and singing, and

a great assembly of people. Then the kinsmen or friend comes bringing that jewel, and going through certain forms, throws it over the girl's neck. She wears it as a token all the rest of her life, and may then dispose of herself as she wills. The man departs without sleeping with her inasmuch as he is her kinsman; if he is not, he may sleep with her, but is not obliged to do so. Thenceforward the mother goes about searching and asking some young men to take her daughter's virginity; they must be Nayars and they regard it among themselves as a disgrace and a foul thing to take a woman's virginity. And when anyone has once slept with her, she is fit for association with men. Then the mother again goes about enquiring among other young Nayars if they wish to support her daughter, and take her as a Mistress so that three or four Nayars agree with her to keep her, and sleep with her, each paying her so much a day; the more lovers she has the greater is her honour. Each of one of them passes a day with her from midday on one day till midday on the next day and so they continue living quietly without any disturbance or quarrels among them. If any of them wishes to leave her, he leaves her, and takes another and she also if she is weary of a man, she tells him to go, and he does go, or makes terms with her. Any children they may have stay with the mother who has to bring them up, for they hold them not to be the children of any man, even if they bear his likeness, and they do not consider them their children, nor are they heirs to their estates, for as I have already stated their heirs are their nephews, sons of their sisters, (which rule whosoever will consider inwardly in his mind will find that it was established with a greater and deeper meaning than the common folk think) for they say that the Kings of the Nayars instituted it in order that the Nayars should not be held back from their service by the burden and labour of rearing children."

"In this kingdom of Malabar there is also another caste of people whom they call Biabares, Indian Merchants, natives of the land. They deal in goods of every kind both in the seaports and inland, wheresoever their trade is of most profit. They gather to themselves all the pepper and ginger from the Nayars and husbandmen and oftentimes they buy the new crops beforehand in exchange for cotton clothes and other goods which they keep at the seaports. Afterwards they sell them again and gain much money thereby. Their privileges are such that the king of the country in which they dwell cannot execute them by legal process."

"There is in this land yet another caste of folk known as Cuiavem. They do not differ from the Nayars, yet by reason of

a fault which they committed, they remain separate from them. Their business is to make pottery and bricks for roofing the houses of the Kings and idols, which are roofed with bricks instead of tiles; only these, for as I have already said, other houses are thatched with branches. They have their own sort of idolatry, and their separate idols."

"There is another Heathen caste which they call Mainatos, whose occupation is to wash clothes for the Kings, Brahmenes and Nayars. By this they live, and may not take up any other."

"There is another lower caste than these which they call Caletis, who are weavers who have no other way of earning save by weaving of cotton and silk clothes, but they are low caste folk and have but little money, so that they clothe the lower races. They are apart by themselves and have their own idolatry."

"Besides the castes mentioned above, there are eleven others lower than they with whom the others do not associate, nor do they touch them under pain of death; and there are great distinctions between one and another of them, preserving them from mixture with one another. The purest of all these low, simple folk they call Tuias. Their work is mainly that of tending the palm-groves and gathering the fruit thereof, and carrying it away for wages on their backs, for there are no beasts of burden in the land."

"There is another caste still lower than these whom they call Manen (Mancu in the printed text) who neither associate with others nor touch them, nor do the other touch them. They are washermen for the common people, and makers of sleeping mats from which occupations all but they are barred; their sons must perforce follow the same trade; they have their own separate idolatry."

"There is another caste in this land still lower whom they call Canaquas. Their trade is making buckles and umbrellas. They learn letters for purposes of astronomy, they are great astrologers, and foretell with great truth things that are to come; there are some lords who maintain them for this cause."

"There is also another lower caste, also Heathens, called Ageres. They are masons, carpenters, smiths, metal workers and some are goldsmiths, all of whom are of a common descent, and a separate caste, and have their idols apart from other folk. They marry, and their sons inherit their property, and learn their fathers' trade."

"There is another caste still lower in this country called Mogeres, they are almost the same as the Tuias, but they do not touch one another. They work as carriers of all things belonging to the Royal

State when it moves from one place to another, but there are very few of them in this land; they are a separate caste; they have no marriage law; the most of them gain their living on the sea, they are sailors, and some of them fishers; they have no idols. They are as well slaves of the Nayars:

“There is another caste yet lower whom they call Monquer, fishers who have no other work than fishing, yet some sail in the Moors’ ship and in those of other Heathens, and they are very expert seamen. This race is very rude, they are shameless thieves; they marry and their sons succeed them, their women are of loose character, they sleep with anyone whosoever and it is held no evil. They have their own idolatry.”

“In this land of Malabar there is another caste of Heathen even lower than those, whom, they call Betunes. Their business is salt-making and rice growing, they have no other livelihood.”

“They dwell in houses standing by themselves in the fields away from the roads, whither the gentlefolk do not walk. They have their own idolatry. They are slaves of the Kings and Nayars and pass their lives in poverty. The Nayars make them walk far away from them and speak to them from a far off. They hold no intercourse with any other caste.”

“There is another caste of Heathen, even lower and ruder, whom they call Paneens, who are great sorcerers and live by no other means.”

“There is another caste lower and ruder than they, named Revoleens a very poor folk, who live by carrying firewood and grass to the towns, they may touch none, nor may any touch them under pain of death. They go naked, covering only their private parts with scant and filthy rags,, the more part of them indeed with leaves of certain trees. Their women wear many brass rings in their ears; and on their necks, arms and legs, necklaces and bracelets of heads.”

“And there is yet another caste of Heathens lower than these whom they call Poleas, who among all the rest are held to be accursed and excommunicate; they dwell in the fields and open campaigns in secret lurking places, whither folk of good caste never go save by mischance, and live in huts very strait and mean. They are tillers of rice with buffaloes and oxen. They never speak to the Nayars save from a far off, shouting so that they may hear them, and when they go along the roads they utter loud cries that they may be let past, and whosoever hears them leaves the road, and stands in the wood till they have passed by; and if anyone whether man or woman, touches them, his kinsfolk slay them forthwith, and



in vengeance therefore they slay Poleas until they are weary without suffering any punishment."

"Yet another caste there is even lower and baser called Parens, who dwell in the most desert places away from all other castes. They have no intercourse with any person nor anyone with them; they are held to be worse than devils, and to be damned. Even to see them is to be unclean and outcaste. They eat yams and other roots of wild plants. They cover their middles with leaves, they also eat the flesh of wild beasts."

"With these end the distinctions between the castes of the Heathen, which are eighteen in all, each one separate and unable to touch others or marry with them; and besides these eighteen castes of the Heathen who are natives of Malabar, which I have now related to you, there are others of outlandish folk merchants and traders in the land, where they possess houses and estates, living like the natives yet with customs of their own."

These foreigners were not able to give a full and detailed picture of caste. This is understandable. For to every foreigner the private life of the Hindu is veiled and it is not possible for him to penetrate it. The social organism of India, the play of its motive forces, is moreover, regulated infinitely more by custom, carrying according to locality and baffling in its complexity, than by any legal formula which can be picked out of a legal text book. But there is no doubt that caste did appear to the foreigner as the most singular and therefore the most distinguishing feature of Hindu society. Otherwise they would not have noted its existence in the record they made of what they observed when they came to India.

Caste therefore is something special in the Hindu social organization and marks off the Hindus from other peoples. Caste has been a growing institution. It has never been the same at all times. The shape and form of Caste as it existed when Megasthenes wrote his account was very different from what the shape and form it had taken when Alberuni came and the appearance it gave to the Portuguese was different from what it was in the time of Alberuni. But to understand caste one must have more exact idea of its nature than these foreigners are able to give.

To follow the discussion of the subject of caste it is necessary to familiarize the reader with some basic conceptions which underlie the Hindu Social Organization. The basic conception of social organization which prevails among the Hindus starts with the rise of four classes or Varnas into which Hindu society is believed to have become divided. These four classes were named (1) Brahmins, the

priestly and the educated class (2) Kshatriyas the military class (3) The Vaishyas the trading class and (4) The Shudras the servant class. For a time these were merely classes. After a time what were only classes (Varnas) became Castes (Jatis) and the four castes became four thousand. In this way the modern caste system was only the evolution of the ancient Varna system.

No doubt the caste system is an evolution of the Varna system. But one can get no idea of the caste system by a study of the Varna system. Caste must be studied apart from Varna.

## II

An old agnostic is said to have summed up his philosophy in the following words :—

“The only thing I know is that I know nothing; and I am not quite sure that I know that”

Sir Denzil Ibbetson undertaking to write about caste in the Punjab said that the words of these agnostic about his philosophy expressed very exactly his own feelings regarding caste. It is no doubt true that owing to local circumstances there does appear a certain diversity about caste matters and that it is very difficult to make any statement regarding any one of the castes. Absolutely true as it may be, as regards one locality which will not be contradicted with equal truth as regards the same caste in some other area.

Although this may be true yet it cannot be difficult to separate the essential and fundamental features of caste from its non-essential and superficial features. An easy way to ascertain this is to ask what are the matters for which a person is liable to be excluded from caste. Mr. Bhattacharya has stated the following as causes for expulsion from caste. (1) Embracing Christianity or Islam (2) Going to Europe or America (3) Marrying a widow (4) Publicly throwing the sacred thread (5) Publicly eating beef, pork or fowl (6) Publicly eating *kachcha* food prepared by a Mahomedan, Christian or low caste Hindu (7) Officiating at the house of a very low caste Shudra (8) By a female going away from home for immoral purposes (9) By a widow becoming pregnant. This list is not exhaustive and omits the three most important causes which entail expulsion from caste. They are (10) Intermarrying outside caste (11) Interdining with persons of another caste and (12) Change of occupation. The second defect in the statement of Mr. Bhattacharya is that it does not make any distinction between essentials and non-essentials.

Of course, when a person is expelled from his caste the penalty is uniform. His friends, relatives and fellowmen refuse to partake of his hospitality. He is not invited to entertainments in their houses. He cannot obtain brides or bridegrooms for his children. Even his married daughters cannot visit him without running the risk of being excluded from caste. His priest, his barber and washerman refuse to serve him. His fellow castemen sever their connection with him so completely that they refuse to assist him even at the funeral of a member of his household. In some cases the man excluded from caste is debarred access to public temples and to the cremation or burial ground.

These reasons for expulsion from caste indirectly show the rules and regulations of the caste. But all regulations are not fundamental. There are many which are unessential. Caste can exist even without them. The essential and unessential can be distinguished by asking another question. When can a Hindu who has lost caste regain his caste? The Hindus have a system of Prayaschitas which are Penances and which a man who has been expelled from caste must perform before he can be admitted to caste fellowship. With regard to these Prayaschitas or Penances certain points must be remembered. In this first place, there are caste offences for which there is no Prayaschita. In the second place, the Prayaschitas vary according to the offence. In some cases the Prayaschitas involve a very small penalty. In other cases the penalty involved is a very severe one.

The existence of a Prayaschita and the absence of it have a significance which must be clearly understood. The absence of Prayaschita does not mean that anyone may commit the offence with impunity. On the contrary it means that the offence is of an immeasurable magnitude and the offender once expelled is beyond reclamation. There is no re-entry for him in the caste from which he is expelled. The existence of a Prayaschita means that the offence is compoundable. The offender can take the prescribed Prayaschita and obtain admission in the caste from which he is expelled.

There are two offences for which there is no penance. These are (1) change from Hindu Religion to another religion (2) Marriage with a person of another caste or another religion. It is obvious if a man loses caste for these offences he loses it permanently.

Of the other offences the prayaschitas prescribed are of the severest kind, are two—(1) interdining with a person of another caste or a non-Hindu and (2) Taking to occupation which is not the occupation of the caste. In the case of the other offences the penalty is a light one almost nominal.

The surest clue to find out what are the fundamental rules of caste and what caste consists it is furnished by the rules regarding *prayaschitas*. Those for the infringement of which there is no *prayaschita* constitute the very soul of caste and those for the infringement of which the *prayaschita* is of the severest kind make up the body of caste. It may therefore be said without any hesitation that there are four fundamental rules of caste. A caste may be defined as a social group having (a) belief in Hindu Religion and bound by certain regulations as to (b) marriage (c) food and (d) occupation. To this one more characteristic may be added namely a social group having a common name by which it is recognized.

In the matter of marriage the regulation lays down that the caste must be endogamous. There can be no intermarriage between members of different castes. This is the first and the most fundamental idea on which the whole fabric of the caste is built up.

In the matter of food the rule is that a person cannot take food from and dine with any person who does not belong to his caste. This means that only those who can intermarry can also interdine. Those who cannot intermarry cannot interdine. In other words, caste is an endogamous unit and also a communal unit.

In the matter of occupation the regulation is that a person must follow the occupation which is the traditional occupation of his caste and if the caste has no occupation then he should follow the occupation of his father.

In the matter of status of a person it is fixed and is hereditary. It is fixed because a person's status is determined by the status of the caste to which he belongs. It is hereditary because a Hindu is stamped with the caste to which his parents belonged, a Hindu cannot change his status because he cannot change his caste. A Hindu is born in a caste and he dies a member of the caste in which he is born. A Hindu may lose his status if he loses caste. But he cannot acquire a new or a better or different status.

What is the significance of a common name for a caste? The significance of this will be clear if we ask two questions which are very relevant and a correct answer to each is necessary for a complete idea of this institution of caste. Social groups are either organized or unorganized. When the membership of the group and the process of joining and leaving the groups, are the subject of definite social regulations and involve certain duties and privileges in relation to other members of the group then the group is an organized group. A group is a voluntary group in which members enter with a full knowledge of what they are doing and the aims which the association

is designed to fulfil. On the other hand, there are groups of which an individual person becomes a member without any act of volition, and becomes subject to social regulation and traditions over which he has no control of any kind.

Now it is hardly necessary to say that caste is a highly organized social grouping. It is not a loose or a floating body. Similarly, it is not necessary to say that caste is an involuntary grouping. A Hindu is born in a caste and he dies as a member of that caste. There is no Hindu without caste, cannot escape caste and being bounded by caste from birth to death he becomes subject to social regulations and traditions of the caste over which he has no control.

The significance of a separate name for a caste lies in this—namely it makes caste an organized and an involuntary grouping. A separate and a distinctive name for a caste makes caste asking to a corporation with a perpetual existence and a seal of separate entity. The significance of separate names for separate castes has not been sufficiently realized by writers on caste. In doing that they have lost sight of a most distinctive feature of caste. Social groups there are and they are bound to be in every society. Many social groups in many countries can be equated to various castes in India and may be regarded as their equivalent. Potters, Washermen, Intellectuals as social groups are everywhere. But in other countries they have remained as unorganized and voluntary groups while in India they have become organized and involuntary i.e., they have become castes because in other countries the social groups were not given name while in India they did. It is the name which the caste bears which gives it fixity and continuity and individuality. It is the name which defines who are its members and in most cases a person born in a caste carries the name of the caste as a part of his surname. Again it is the name which makes it easy for the caste to enforce its rules and regulations. It makes it easy in two ways. In the first place, the name of the caste forming a surname of the individual prevents the offender in passing off as a person belonging to another caste and thus escape the jurisdiction of the caste. Secondly, it helps to identify the offending individual and the caste to whose jurisdiction he is subject so that he is easily handed up and punished for any breach of the caste rules.

This is what caste means. Now as to the caste system. This involves the study of the mutual relations between different castes. Looked at as a collection of caste, the caste system presents several features which at once strike the observer. In the first place there is no inter-connection between the various castes which form a system. Each caste is separate and distinct. It is independent and sovereign in the disposal of its

internal affairs and the enforcement of caste regulations. The castes touch but they do not interpenetrate. The second feature relates to the order in which one caste stands in relation to the other castes in the system. That order is vertical and not horizontal.

Such is the caste and such is the caste system. Question is, is this enough to know the Hindu social organization? For a static conception of the Hindu social organization an idea of the caste and the caste system is enough. One need not trouble to remember more than the facts that the Hindus are divided into castes and that the castes form a system in which all hang on a thread which runs through the system in such a way that while encircling and separating one caste from another it holds them all as though it was a string of tennis balls hanging one above the other. But this will not be enough to understand caste as a dynamic phenomenon. To follow the workings of caste in action it is necessary to note one other feature of caste besides the caste system, namely class-caste system.

The relationship between the ideas of caste and class has been a matter of lively controversy. Some say that caste is analogous to class and that there is no difference between the two. Others hold that the idea of castes is fundamentally opposed to that of class. This is an aspect of the subject of caste about which more will be said hereafter. For the present it is necessary to emphasize one feature of the caste system which has not been referred to hereinbefore. It is this. Although caste is different from and opposed to the notion of class yet the caste-system—as distinguished from caste—recognizes a class system which is somewhat different from the graded status referred to above. Just as the Hindus are divided into so many castes, castes are divided into different classes of castes. The Hindu is caste-conscious. He is also class conscious. Whether he is caste conscious or class conscious depends upon the caste with which he comes in conflict. If the caste with which he comes in conflict is a caste within the class to which he belongs he is caste conscious. If the caste is outside the class to which he belongs he is class conscious. Anyone who needs any evidence on this point may study the Non-Brahmin Movement in the Madras and the Bombay Presidency. Such a study will leave no doubt that to a Hindu caste periphery is as real as class periphery and caste consciousness is as real as class consciousness.

Caste, it is said, is an evolution of the Varna system. I will show later on that this is nonsense. Caste is a perversion of Varna. At any rate it is an evolution in the opposite direction. But while caste has completely perverted the Varna system it has borrowed the class

system from the Varna system. Indeed the Class-caste system follows closely the class cleavages of the Varna system.

Looking at the caste system from this point of view one comes across several lines of class cleavage which run through this pyramid of castes dividing the pyramid into blocks of castes. The first line of cleavage follows the line of division noticeable in the ancient Chaturvarna system. The old system of Chaturvarna made a distinction between the first three Varnas, the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and the fourth Varna namely the Shudra. The three former were classes as the Regenerate classes. The Shudra was held as the Unregenerate class. This distinction was based upon the fact that the former were entitled to wear the sacred thread and study the Vedas. The Shudra was entitled to neither and that is why he was regarded as the unregenerate class. This line of cleavage is still in existence and forms the basis of the present day class division separating the castes which have grown out of the vast class of Shudras from those which have grown out of the three classes of Brahmins, the Kshatriyas and Vaishyas. This line of class cleavage is the one which is expressed by the terms High Castes and Low Castes and which are short forms for the High Class Castes and Low Class Castes.

Next after this line of cleavage there runs through the pyramid a second line of class cleavage. It runs just below the Low Class Castes. It sets above all the castes born out of the four Varnas i.e., the High Castes as well as the low castes above the remaining castes which I will merely describe as the 'rest'. This line of class cleavage is again a real one and follows the well-defined distinction which was a fundamental principle of the Chaturvarna system. The Chaturvarna system as is pointed out made a distinction between the four Varnas putting the three Varnas above the fourth. But it also made an equally clear distinction between those within the Chaturvarna and those outside the Chaturvarna. It had a terminology to express this distinction. Those within the Chaturvarna—high or low, Brahmin or Shudra were called *Savarna* i.e., those with the stamp of the Varna. Those outside the Chaturvarna were called *Avarna* i.e., those without the stamp of Varna. All the castes which have evolved out of the four varnas are called *Savarna Hindus*—which is rendered English by the term *Caste Hindus*—The 'rest' are the *Avarnas* who in present parlance spoken of by Europeans as *Non-caste Hindus* i.e., those who are outside the four original castes or varnas.

Much that is written about the caste system has reference mostly to the caste-system among the *Savarna Hindus*. Very little is known about the *Avarna Hindus*. Who are these *Avarna Hindus*, what is their

position in Hindu Society, how are they related to the Savarna Hindus are questions to which no attention has so far been paid. I am sure that without considering these questions no one can get a true picture of the social structure the Hindus have built. To leave out the Class cleavage between the Savarna Hindus and the Avarna Hindus is to relate Grimm's Fairy Tale which leaves out the witches, the goblins and the orges.

The Avarna Hindus comprise three

(INCOMPLETE)

□ □



## Part III

---

### Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Ancient India

*Dr. B. R. Ambedkar had proposed to write a treatise, 'ie., 'Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Ancient India'. The table of contents has been printed in the chapter of schemes. He had originally planned to write seven books to be included under this broad title. The Committee was able to find some pages and few chapters in his collection. The chapters are also incomplete. After scrutiny, the Committee came to a decision that 'Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Ancient India' is to be presented in this volume with the available material though incomplete. Dr. Ambedkar considered the rise of Buddhism as revolution. The Counter-Revolution pioneered by Brahmins' resulted into decline and fall of Buddhism.*

*Contd. overleaf*

*As such the following chapters are included under this title.*

- 1. Ancient India on Exhumation*
- 2. The Ancient Regime—The State of the Aryan Society*
- 3. A Sunken Priesthood*
- 4. Reformers and Their Fate*
- 5. The Decline and Fall of Buddhism*
- 6. The Literature of Brahminism*
- 7. Triumph of Brahminism*
- 8. The Morals of the House—Manusmruti or the Gospel of Counter-Revolution*
- 9. Philosophic Defence of Counter-Revolution (Krishna and his Gita)*
- 10. Analysis of Virat Parva and Uddyog Parva*
- 11. Brahmins V/s Kshatriyas*
- 12. The Shudras and the Counter-Revolution*
- 13. The Women and the Counter-Revolution*

*The readers may compare these chapters with the proposed plan given in the last chapters of Schemes.—Editors*

## CHAPTER 5

### Ancient India On Exhumation

*There are two typed copies of this Chapter. Both of them contain additions and corrections in the handwriting of Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar. After consideration, we decided that the latter version should be included here. This essay, consisting of three pages only, seems to be an introduction to a larger subject Dr. Ambedkar probably had in his mind.—Editors.*

Much of the ancient history of India is no history at all. Not that ancient India has no history. It has plenty of it. But it has lost its character. It has been made mythology to amuse women and children. This seems to have been done deliberately by the Brahminical writers. Take the word *Deva*. What does it mean? Is the word *Jana Vishesh* represent a member of the human family? It is made to appear superhuman agency. By this the pith of history contained in it is squeezed out.

Along with the word *Deva* occur the names of *Yaksha*, *Gana*, *Gandharva*, *Kinnars*. Who were they? The impression one gets on reading the *Mahabharat* and *Ramayan* is that they are imaginary beings who filled the horizon but did not exist.

But the *Yaksha*, *Gana*, *Gandharva*, *Kinnaras* were also members of the human family. They were in the service of the *Devas*. The *Yakshas* were guarding the palaces. *Ganas* were guarding the *Devas*. *Gandharvas* were amusing the *Devas* by music and dancing. The *Kinnaras* were also in the service of the Gods. The descendants of the *Kinnaras* are even now living in *Himachal Pradesh*.

Take the name *Asura*. The description of *Asura* given in the *Mahabharat* and *Ramayana* make out as though they belonged to non-human world. An *Asura* is described to eat ten carts-load of food. They are monsters in size. They sleep for six months. They have ten mouths. Who is a *Rakshas*? He too is described as a non-human creature. In size, in his capacity for eating, in his habits of life he resembled the *Asura*.

There is a plenty of references to the Nagas. But who is a Naga? A Naga is represented as a serpent or a snake. Can this be true? Whether true or not, it is so and Hindus believe it. Ancient Indian history must be exhumed. Without its exhumation Ancient India will go without history. Fortunately with the help of the Buddhist literature, Ancient Indian History can be dug out of the debris which the Brahmin writers have heaped upon in a fit of madness.

The Buddhist literature helps a great deal to remove the debris and see the underlying substance quite clearly and distinctly.

The Buddhist literature shows that the Devas were a community of human beings. There are so many Devas who come to the Buddha to have their doubts and difficulties removed. How could this be unless the Devas were human beings.

Again the Buddhist canonical literature throws a flood of light on the puzzling question of the Nagas. It makes a distinction between womb-born Nagas and egg-born Nagas and thereby making it clear that the word Naga has two-fold meaning. In its original sense it stood for the name of a human community.

The Asuras again are not monsters. They too are a Jan-Vishesh human beings. According to Satpatha Bramhana, the Asuras are the descendants of Prajapati the Lord of the creation. How they became evil spirits is not known. But the fact is recorded that they fought against the Devas for the possession of the earth and that they were overcome by the Devas and that they finally succumbed. The point is clear that the Asuras were members of the human family and not monsters.

With this exhumation of debris, we can see Ancient Indian History in a new light.

## CHAPTER 6

### The Ancient Regime : The State of the Aryan Society

*This essay consists of 11 typed foolscap pages tagged into a file. From the last sentence it appears that the Chapter is incomplete.*—Editors

#### I

Buddhism was a revolution. It was as great a Revolution as the French Revolution. Though it began as a Religious revolution, it became more than Religious revolution. It became a Social and Political Revolution. To be able to realize how profound was the character of this Revolution, it is necessary to know the state of the society before the revolution began its course. To use the language of the French Revolution, it is necessary to have a picture of the ancient regime in India.

To understand the great reform which he brought about by his teaching, it is necessary to have some idea of the degraded condition of the Aryan civilization at the time when Buddha started on the mission of his life.

The Aryan Community of his time was steeped in the worst kind of debauchery; social, religious and spiritual.

To mention only a few of the social evils, attention may be drawn to gambling. Gambling had become as widespread among the Aryans as drinking.

Every king had a hall of gambling attached to his palace. Every king had an expert gambler in his employment as a companion to play with. King *Virat* had in his employment *Kank* as an expert gambler. Gambling was not merely a pastime with kings. They played with heavy stakes. They staked kingdoms, dependents, relatives, slaves, servants.<sup>1</sup> King *Nala* staked everything in gambling with *Paskkar* and lost everything. The only thing he did not stake was himself and his

<sup>1</sup> Mahabharat—Vanaparva.

wife Damayanti. Nala had to go and live in the forest as a beggar. There were kings who went beyond Nala. The Mahabharat<sup>1</sup> tells how Dharma the eldest of the Pandavas gambled and staked everything, his brothers and also his and their wife Draupadi. Gambling was a matter of honour with the Aryans and any invitation to gamble was regarded as an injury to one's honour and dignity. Dharma gambled with such disastrous consequences although he was warned beforehand. His excuse was that he was invited to gamble and that as a man of honour, he could not decline such an invitation.

This vice of gambling was not confined to kings. It had infected even the common folk. Rig-Veda contains lamentations of a poor Aryan ruined by gambling. The habit of gambling had become so common in Kautilya's time that there were gambling houses licensed by the king from which the king derived considerable revenue.

Drinking was another evil which was rampant among the Aryans. Liquors were of two sorts *Soma* and *Sura*. *Soma* was a sacrificial wine. The drinking of the Soma was in the beginning permitted only to Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas. Subsequently it was permitted only to Brahmins and Kshatriyas. The Vaishyas were excluded from it and the Shudras were never permitted to taste it. Its manufacture was a secret known only to the Brahmins. *Sura* was open to all and was drunk by all. The Brahmins also drank Sura. Shukracharya the priest to the *Asuras* drank so heavily that in his drunken state he gave the life giving *Mantra* known to him only and with which he used to revive the *Asuras* killed by the Devas—to *Katch* the son of Brahaspati who was the priest of the Devas. The Mahabharat mentions an occasion when both Krishna and Arjuna were dead drunk. That shows that the best among the Aryan Society were not only not free from the drink habit but that they drank heavily. The most shameful part of it was that even the Aryan women were addicted to drink. For instance *Sudeshna*<sup>2</sup> the wife of King Virat tells her maid *Sairandhri* to go to *Kichaka's* palace and bring Sura as she was dying to have a drink. It is not to be supposed that only queens indulged in drinking. The habit of drinking was common among women of all classes and even Brahmin women were not free from it. That liquor and dancing was indulged in by the Aryan women is clear from the *Kausitaki Grihya Sutra* I. 11-12, which says; "Four or eight women who are not widowed, after having been regaled with wine and food are to dance for four times on the night previous to the wedding ceremony."

<sup>1</sup> Mahabharat—Sabhaparva.

<sup>2</sup> Vanaparva, Adh. XV. 10.

That the drinking of intoxicating liquor was indulged in by Brahmin women, not to speak of women of the lower *Varnas*, as late as the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. in the Central region of Aryavarta, is clear from Kumarila Bhatta's *Tantra-Vartika* I (iii). 4, which states, "Among the people of modern days we find the Brahmin women of the countries of Ahicchatra and Mathura to be addicted to drinking". Kumarila condemned the practice in the case of Brahmins only, but not of Kshatriyas and Vaishyas men and women, if the liquor was distilled from fruits or flowers (Madhavi), and Molasses (Gaudi) and not from grains (Sura).

The sexual immorality of the Aryan Society must shock their present day descendants. The Aryans of pre-Buddhist days had no such rule of prohibited degrees as we have today to govern their sexual or matrimonial relationship.

According to the Aryan Mythology, Brahma is the creator. Brahma had three sons and a daughter. His one son Daksha married his sister. The daughters born of this marriage between brother and sister were married some to Kashyapa the son of Marichi the son of Brahma and some to Dharma the third son of Brahma.<sup>1</sup>

In the Rig-Veda there is an episode related of Yama and Yami brother and sister. According to this episode Yami the sister invites her brother Yama to cohabit with her and becomes angry when he refuses to do so.<sup>2</sup>

A father could marry his daughter. *Vashishta* married his own daughter *Shatrupa* when she came of age.<sup>3</sup> *Manu* married his daughter *Ila*.<sup>4</sup> *Janhu* married his daughter *Janhavi*.<sup>5</sup> *Surya* married his daughter *Usha*.<sup>6</sup>

There was polyandri not of the ordinary type. The polyandri prevalent among the Aryans was a polyandri when kinsmen cohabited with one woman. Dhahaprachetani and his son Soma cohabited with Marisha the daughter of Soma.<sup>7</sup>

Instances of grandfather marrying his grand-daughter are not wanting. Daksha gave his daughter in marriage to his father Brahma<sup>8</sup> and from that marriage was born the famous Narada. Dauhitra gave his 27 daughters to his father Soma for cohabitation and procreation.<sup>9</sup>

The Aryans did not mind co-habiting with women in the open and within sight of people. The Rishis used to perform certain religious

<sup>1</sup> Mahabharat Adiparva. Adh. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Rig. Veda.

<sup>3</sup> Hari Vansha Adh. II.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. Adh. X.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. Adh. XXVII.

<sup>6</sup> Yask Nirutta Adh. V. Khanda VI.

<sup>7</sup> Harivansha Adh. II.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. Adh. III.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

rites which were called *Vamdevya vrata*. These rites used to be performed on the *Yadnya bhumi*. If any woman came there and expressed a desire for sexual intercourse and asked the sage to satisfy her, the sage used to cohabit with her then and there in the open on the *Yadnya bhumi*. Instances of this may be mentioned. The case of the sage Parashara had sexual intercourse with Satyavati and also of Dirghatapa. That such a custom was common is shown by the existence of the word Ayoni. The word Ayoni is understood to mean of immaculate conception. That is not however the original meaning of the word. The original meaning of the word Yoni is house. Ayoni means conceived out of the house i.e. in the open. That there was nothing deemed to be wrong in this is clear from the fact that both Sita and Draupadi were Ayonija. That this was very common is clear from the fact that religious injunctions had to be issued against such a practice.<sup>1</sup>

There was prevalent among the Aryans the practice of renting out their women to others for a time. As an illustration may be mentioned the story of *Madhavi*.<sup>2</sup> The king *Yayati* gave his daughter *Madhavi* as an offering to his Guru *Galav*. *Galav* rented out the girl *Madhavi* to three kings, each a period. Thereafter he gave her in marriage to *Vishwamitra*. She remained with him until a son was born to her. Thereafter *Galav* took away the girl and gave her back to her father *Yayati*.

Besides the practice of letting out women to others temporarily at a rent there was prevalent among the Aryans another practice namely allowing procreation by the best amongst them. Raising a family was treated by them as though it was a breeding or stock raising. Among the Aryas there was a class of persons called *Devas* who were Aryans but of a superior status and prowess. The Aryans allowed their women to have sexual intercourse with any one of the class of *Devas* in the interest of good breeding. This practice prevailed so extensively that the *Devas* came to regard prelibation in respect of the Aryan Women as their prescriptive right. No Aryan woman could be married unless this right of prelibation had been redeemed and the woman released from the control of the *Devas* by offering what was technically called *Avadan*. The *Laja Hoame* which is performed in every Hindu marriage and the details of which are given in the *Ashwalayan Grahya Sutra* is a relic of this act of the redemption of the Aryan woman from the right of prelibation of the *Devas*. The *Avadan* in the *Laja Hoama* is nothing but the price for the existinguishment of the right of the *Devas* over

<sup>1</sup> Mahabharat, Adi Parva—Adh. 193.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* Udyoga Parva—Adh. 106-123.



the bride. The *Saptapadi* performed in all Hindu marriages and which is regarded as the most essential ceremony without which there is no lawful marriage has an integral connection with this right of prelibation of the Devas. Saptapadi means walking by the bridegroom seven steps with the bride. Why is this essential? The answer is that the Devas, if they were dissatisfied with the compensation, could claim the woman before the seventh step was taken. After the seventh step was taken, the right of the Devas was extinguished and the bridegroom could take away the bride and live as husband and wife without being obstructed or molested by the Devas.

There was no rule of chastity for maidens. A girl could have sexual intercourse with and also progeny from anybody without contracting marriage. This is evident from the root meaning of the word *Kanya* which means a girl. *Kanya* comes from the root *Kam* which means a girl free to offer herself to any man. That they did offer themselves to any man and had children without contracting regular marriage is illustrated by the case of *Kunti* and *Matsyagandha*. *Kunti* had children from different men before she was married to *Pandu* and *Matsyagandha* had sexual intercourse with the sage *Parashara* before she married to *Shantanu* the father of *Bhishma*.

Beastiality was also prevalent among the Aryans. The story of the sage Dam having sexual intercourse with a female deer, is well known. Another instance is that of *Surya* cohabiting with a mare. But the most hideous instance is that of the woman having sexual intercourse with the horse in the *Ashvamedha Yajna*.

(INCOMPLETE)

□ □

## CHAPTER 7

### A Sunken Priesthood

*This essay is numbered as Chapter III in the file of the Ancient Regime and contains 16 foolscap typed pages. This Chapter also seems to be left incomplete.—Editors.*

The priestly profession in the ancient Aryan Society was monopolized by the Brahmins. None except a Brahmin could become a priest. As custodians of religion, the Brahmins were the guides of the people in moral and spiritual matters. They were to set the standard for people to follow. Did the Brahmins act up to the standard? Unfortunately, all the evidence we have, shows that the Brahmins had fallen to the utmost depth of moral degradation.

A Shrotriya Brahmin was supposed not to keep with him a store of provision lasting for more than a week. But they had systematically trampled upon this rule and were addicted to the use of the things stored up; stores, to wit, of foods, drinks, clothing, equipages, beddings, perfumes, and curry-stuffs.

The Brahmins were addicted to visiting shows such as:—

- (1) Nautch dances (nakkam).
- (2) Singings of songs (gitam).
- (3) Instrumental music (vaditam).
- (4) Shows at fairs (pekham).
- (5) Ballads recitations (akkhanam).
- (6) Hand music (panisaram).
- (7) The chanting of bards (vetals).
- (8) Tam-tam playing (kumbiathunam).
- (9) Fair scenes (sobhanagarkam).
- (10) Acrobatic feats by Kandalas (Kandala-vamsa-dhopanam).
- (11) Combats of elephants, horses, buffaloes, bulls, goats, rams, cocks and quails.
- (12) Bouts at quarterstaff, boxing, wrestling.
- (13-16) Sham-fights, roll-calls, manoeuvres, reviews.

They were addicted to games and recreations; that is to say,

- (1) Games on boards with eight, or with ten rows of squares.
- (2) The same games played by imagining such boards in the air.
- (3) Keeping going over diagrams drawn on the ground so that one steps only where one ought to go.
- (4) Either removing the pieces or men from a heap with one's nail, or putting them into a heap, in each case without shaking it. He who shakes the heap, loses.
- (5) Throwing dice.
- (6) Hitting a short stick with a long one.
- (7) Dipping the hand with the fingers stretched out in lac, or red dye, or flour water, and striking the wet hand on the ground or on a wall, calling out 'what shall it be?' and showing the form required—elephants, horses & c.
- (8) Games with balls.
- (9) Blowing through toy pipes made of leaves.
- (10) Ploughing with toy ploughs.
- (11) Turning summersaults.
- (12) Playing with toy windmills made of palm leaves.
- (13) Playing with toy measures made of palm leaves.
- (14, 15) Playing with toy carts or toy bows.
- (16) Guessing at letters traced in the air, or on a playfellow's back.
- (17) Guessing the playfellow's thoughts.
- (18) Mimicry of deformities.

They were addicted to the use of high and large couches; that is to say:

- (1) Moveable settees, high, and six feet long (Asandi).
- (2) Divans with animal figures carved on the supports (Pallanko).
- (3) Goat's hair coverings with very long fleece (Gonako).
- (4) Patchwork counterpanes of many colours (Kittaka).
- (5) White blankets (Patika).
- (6) Woollen coverlets embroidered with flowers (Patalika).
- (7) Quilts stuffed with cotton wool (Tulika).
- (8) Coverlets embroidered with figures of lions, tigers, & c., (Vikatika).
- (9) Rugs with fur on both sides (Uddalom).
- (10) Rugs with fur on one side (Ekantalomi).
- (11) Coverlets embroidered with gems (Katthissam).
- (12) Silk coverlets (Koseyyam).
- (13) Carpets large enough for sixteen dancers (Kuttakam).
- (14-16) Elephant, horse and chariot rugs.
- (17) Rugs of antelope skins sewn together (Aginapaveni).

- (18) Rugs of skins of the plantain antelope.
- (19) Carpets with awnings above them (Sauttarakkhadam).
- (20) Sofas with red pillows for the head and feet”.

The Brahmins were addicted to the use of means for adorning and beautifying themselves; that is to say:

Rubbing in scented powders on one's body, shampooing it, and bathing it, patting the limbs with clubs after the manner of wrestlers, the use of mirrors, eye-ointments, garlands, rouge, cosmetics, bracelets, necklaces, walking-sticks, reed cases for drugs, rapiers, sunshades, embroidered slippers, turbans, diadems, whisks of the yak tail and long-fringed white robes.

The Brahmins were addicted to such low conversation as these:

Tales of kings, of robbers, of ministers of state; tales of war, of terrors, of battles; talk about foods and drinks, clothes, beds, garlands, perfumes; talks about relationships, equipages, villages, towns, cities and countries; tales about women, and about heroes; gossip at street corners, or places whence water is fetched; ghost stories; desultory talk; speculations about the creation of the land or sea, or about existence and non-existence.

The Brahmins were addicted to the use of wrangling phrases: such as:

“You don't understand this doctrine and discipline, I do.”

“How should you know about this doctrine and discipline?”

“You have fallen into wrong views. It is I who am in the right.”

“I am speaking to the point, you are not.”

“You are putting last what ought to come first, and first what ought to come last.”

“What you've ex-cogitated so long, that is all quite upset.”

“You are proved to be wrong.”

“Set to work to clear your views.”

“Disentangle yourself if you can.”

The Brahmins were addicted to taking messages, going on errands, and acting as go-betweens; to wit, on kings, ministers of state, Kshatriyas, Brahmins, or young men, saying: ‘Go there, come hither, take this with you, bring that from thence.’

‘The Brahmins were tricksters, droner out (of holy words for pray), diviners, and exorcists, ever hungering to add gain to gain.’

The Brahmins earned their living by wrong means of livelihood, by low arts, such as these:

- (1) Palmistry—prophesying long life, prosperity, & c., (or the reverse from marks on a child's hands, feet, & c.)
- (2) Divining by means of omens and signs.

- (3) Auguries drawn from thunderbolts and other celestial portents.
- (4) Prognostication by interpreting dreams.
- (5) Fortune-telling from marks on the body.
- (6) Auguries from the marks on cloth gnawed by mice.
- (7) Sacrificing to Agni.
- (8) Offering oblations from a spoon.
- (9-13) Making offerings to gods of husks, of the red powder between the grain and the husk, of husked grain ready for boiling, or ghee and of oil.
- (14) Sacrificing by spewing mustard seeds, & c., into the fire out of one's mouth.
- (15) Drawing blood from one's right knee as a sacrifice to the gods.
- (16) Looking at the knuckles, & c., and, after muttering a charm, divining whether a man is well born of luck or not.
- (17) Determining whether the site for a proposed house or pleasance, is luck or not.
- (18) Advising on customary law.
- (19) Laying demons in a cemetery.
- (20) Laying ghosts.
- (21) Knowledge of the charms to be used when lodging in an earth house.
- (22) Snake charming.
- (23) The poison craft.
- (24) The scorpion craft.
- (25) The mouse craft.
- (26) The bird craft.
- (27) The crow craft.
- (28) Foretelling the number of years that man has yet to live.
- (29) Giving charms to ward off arrows.
- (30) The animal wheel.

The Brahmins earned their living by wrong means of livelihood, by low arts, such as these:

Knowledge of the signs of good and bad qualities in the following things and of the marks in them denoting the health or luck of their owners: to wit,

gems, staves, garments, swords, arrows, bows, other weapons, women, men, boys, girls, slaves, slave-girls, elephants, horses, buffaloes, bulls, oxen, goats, sheep, fowls, quails, iguanas, herrings, tortoises, and other animals.

The Brahmins, earned their living by wrong means of livelihood by low arts such as soothsaying, to the effect that :

The chiefs will march out.

The home chiefs will attack and the enemies retreat.

The enemies' chiefs will attack, and ours will retreat.

The home chiefs will gain the victory, and ours will suffer defeat.

The foreign chiefs will gain the victory on this side, and ours will suffer defeat.

Thus will there be victory on this side, defeat on that.

The Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of livelihood, by such low arts as foretelling :

- (1) There will be an eclipse of the Moon.
- (2) There will be an eclipse of the Sun.
- (3) There will be an eclipse of a star (Nakshatra).
- (4) There will be aberration of the Sun or the Moon.
- (5) The Sun or the Moon will return to its usual path.
- (6) There will be aberrations of the stars.
- (7) The stars will return to their usual course.
- (8) There will be a jungle fire.
- (9) There will be a fall of meteors.
- (10) There will be an earthquake.
- (11) The god will thunder.
- (12-15) There will be rising and setting, clearness and dimness of the Sun or the Moon or the stars, or foretelling of each of these fifteen phenomena that they will betoken such and such a result. "

The Brahmins earned their living by wrong means of the livelihood, by low arts, such as these :

Foretelling an abundant rainfall.

Foretelling a deficient rainfall.

Foretelling a good harvest.

Foretelling scarcity of food.

Foretelling tranquility.

Foretelling disturbances.

Foretelling a pestilence.

Foretelling a healthy season.

Counting on the fingers.

Counting without using the fingers.

Summing up large totals.

Composing ballads, poetizing.

Casuistry, sophistry.

The Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of livelihood, by low arts, such as:

- (1) Arranging a lucky day for marriages in which the bride or bridegroom is brought home.
- (2) Arranging a lucky day for marriages in which the bride or bridegroom is sent forth.
- (3) Fixing a lucky time for the conclusion of treaties of peace (or using charms to procure harmony).
- (4) Fixing a lucky time for the outbreak of hostilities (or using charms to make discord).
- (5) Fixing a lucky time for the calling in of debts (or charms for success in throwing dice).
- (6) Fixing a lucky time for the expenditure of money (or charms to bring ill luck to an opponent throwing dice).
- (7) Using charms to make people lucky.
- (8) Using charms to make people unlucky.
- (9) Using charms to procure abortion.
- (10) Incantations to keep a man's jaws fixed.
- (11) Incantations to bring on dumbness.
- (12) Incantations to make a man throw up his hands.
- (13) Incantations to bring on deafness.
- (14) Obtaining oracular answers by means of the magic mirror.
- (15) Obtaining oracular answers through a girl possessed.
- (16) Obtaining oracular answers from a god.
- (17) The worship of the Sun.
- (18) The worship of the Great One.
- (19) Bringing forth flames from one's mouth.
- (20) Invoking Siri, the goddess of Luck.

The Brahmins earned their living by wrong means of livelihood, by low arts, such as these:

- (1) Vowing gifts to a god if a certain benefit be granted.
- (2) Paying such vows.
- (3) Repeating charms while lodging in an earth house.
- (4) Causing virility.
- (5) Making a man impotent.
- (6) Fixing on lucky sites for dwellings.
- (7) Consecrating sites.
- (8) Ceremonial rinsings of the mouth.
- (9) Ceremonial bathings.
- (10) Offering sacrifices.
- (11-14) Administering emetics and purgatives.

- (15) Purging people to relieve the head (that is by giving drugs to make people sneeze).
- (16) Oiling people's ears (either to make them grow or to heal sores on them).
- (17) Satisfying people's eyes (soothing them by dropping medicinal oils into them).
- (18) Administering drugs through the nose.
- (19) Applying collyrium to the eyes.
- (20) Giving medicinal ointment for the eyes.
- (21) Practising as an oculist.
- (22) Practising as a surgeon.
- (23) Practising as a doctor for children.
- (24) Administering roots and drugs.
- (25) Administering medicines in rotation.

(INCOMPLETE)

□ □



## CHAPTER 8

### Reformers and Their Fate

*This is a typed bound copy consisting of 87 pages. The Ambatta Sutta starts at page 69 of the manuscript and after page 70, pages are numbered from A to Z. The beginning of page 71 starts with Lohikka Sutta.—Editors.*

I. Aryan Society. II. Buddha and Reform. III.

#### I

It was Sir T. Madhava Raw who speaking of Hindu Society of his time said :

“The longer one lives, observes, and thinks, the more deeply does he feel that there is no community on the face of the earth which suffers less from political evils and more from self-inflicted or self-accepted or self-created, and therefore avoidable evils, than the Hindu Community.”

This view expresses quite accurately and without exaggeration the necessity of social reform in Hindu Society.

The first Social Reformer and the greatest of them all is Gautama Buddha. Any history of Social Reform must begin with him and no history of Social Reform in India will be complete which omits to take account of his great achievements.

Siddhartha, surname Gautama, was born in the Sakya clan at Kapilvastu in Northern India, on the borders of Nepal in 563 B.C. Tradition says he was a prince. He received education fit for a prince, was married and had a son. Oppressed by the evils and misery then prevalent in the Aryan Society he renounced the world at the age of twenty-nine and left his home in search for truth and deliverance. He became a mendicant and studied with two distinguished teachers, but finding that their teachings did not satisfy him he left them and became an ascetic. He gave up that also as being futile. By hard thinking he got insight into things and as a result of this insight he formulated his own

*Dhamma*. This was at the age of thirty-five. The remainder of his eighty years he spent in spreading his Dhamma and founding and administering an order of monks. He died about the year 483 B.C. at Kusinara surrounded by his devoted followers.

To the carrying out of his mission, the Buddha devoted all his days after the achievement of enlightenment. His time was divided between feeding the lamp of his own spiritual life by solitary meditation—just as Jesus spent hours in lonely prayer—and active preaching to large audiences of his monks, instructing the more advanced in the subtle points of inner development, directing the affairs of the Order, rebuking breaches of discipline, confirming the faithful in their virtue, receiving deputations, carrying on discussions with learned opponents, comforting the sorrowful, visiting kings and peasants, Brahmins and outcasts, rich and poor. He was a friend of publicans and sinners, and many a public harlot, finding herself understood and pitied, gave up her evil ways to take refuge in the “Blessed One”. Such a life demanded a variety of moral qualities and social gifts, and among others a combination of democratic sentiments with an aristocratic *Savoir Faire* which is seldom met with. In reading the dialogues one can never forget that Gotama had the birth and upbringing of an aristocrat. He converses not only with Brahmins and pundits but with princes and ministers and kings on easy and equal terms. He is a good diner-out, with a fund of anecdotes and apparently a real sense of humour, and is a welcome guest at every house. A distinguished Brahmin is pictured as describing him thus:

‘The venerable Gotama is well born on both sides, of pure descent..... is handsome, pleasant to look upon, inspiring trust, gifted with great beauty of complexion, fair in colour, fine in presence, stately to behold, virtuous with the virtue of the Arhats, gifted with goodness and virtue and with a pleasant voice and polite address, with no passion of lust left in him nor any fickleness of mind. He bids all men welcome, is congenial, conciliatory, not supercilious, accessible to all, not backward in conversation.’

But what appealed most to the India of his time, and has appealed most to India through the ages, is expressed by the Brahmin in these words:

“The monk Gotama has gone forth into the religious life, giving up the great clan of his relatives, giving up much money and gold, treasure both buried and above ground. Truly while he was still a young man, without a gray hair on his head, in the beauty of his early manhood he went forth from the household life into the homeless state.”

“Such a life as his, demanded not only pleasant manners, sympathy and kindness, but firmness and courage. When the occasion required it, he could be calmly severe with those who worked evil for the Order. Physical pain, he bore not only with equanimity but with no diminution of his inner joy. Courage also was needed and was found; as, for example, in the Buddha’s calm attitude during Devadatta’s various attempts to assassinate him, in facing threats of murder, and in the conversion of the famous bandit in the Kingdom of Kosala, whom all the countryside feared, and whom the Buddha visited, alone and unarmed, in his lair, changing him from a scourge of the kingdom to a peaceful member of the Order. Neither pain, danger, nor insults marred his spiritual peace. When he was reviled he reviled not again. Nor was he lacking in tender thoughtfulness for those who needed his comfort and support.”

He was beloved of all. Repeatedly he is described or describes himself, as one born into the world for the good of the many, for the happiness of the many, for the advantage, the good, the happiness of gods and men, out of compassion for the world.

He left an indelible mark on the Aryan Society and although his name has gone out of India the impression of his teaching still remains.

His religion spread like wild fire. It soon became the religion of the whole of India. But it did not remain confined to India. It reached every corner of the then known world. All races accepted it. Even the Afghans were once Buddhists. It did not remain confined to Asia. There is evidence to show that Buddhism was the religion of celtic Britain.\*

What was the cause of this rapid spread of Buddhism? On this point what Prof. Hopkins has said is worth quoting. This is what he says:

“The cause, then, of the rapid spread of Buddhism at the beginning of its career lies only in the conditions of its teaching and the influential backing of its founder. It was the individual Buddha that captivated men; it was the teaching that emanated from him that fired enthusiasm; it was his position as an aristocrat that made him acceptable to the aristocracy, his magnetism that made him the idol of the people. From every page stands out the strong, attractive personality of this teacher and winner of hearts. No man ever lived so godless yet so godlike. Arrogating to himself no divinity, despairing of future bliss, but without fear as without hope, leader of thought but despising lovingly the folly of the world, exalted but

\* Dr. Donald A. Mackenzie, *Buddhism in Pre-Christian Britain*, Blackie & Son, London, 1928.—Editors.

adored, the universal brother, he wandered among men, simply, serenely; with gentle irony subduing them that opposed him, to congregation after congregation speaking with majestic sweetness, the master to each, the friend of all. His voice was singularly vibrant and eloquent; his very tones convinced the hearer, his looks inspired awe. From the tradition it appears that he must have been one of those whose personality alone suffices to make a man not only a leader but a god to the hearts of his fellows. When such a one speaks he obtains hearers. It matters little what he says, for he influences the motions, and bends whoever listens to his will. But if added to this personality, if encompassing it, there be the feeling in the minds of others that what this man teaches is not only a variety, but the very hope of their salvation; if for the first time they recognize in his words the truth that makes of slaves free men, of classes a brotherhood, then it is not difficult to see wherein lies the lightninglike speed with which the electric current passes from heart to heart. Such a man was Buddha, such was the essential of his teaching; and such was the inevitable rapidity of Buddhist expansion and the profound influence of the shock that was produced by the new faith upon the moral consciousness of Buddha's people."

To understand the great reform which he brought about by his teaching, it is necessary to have some idea of the degraded condition of the Aryan civilization at the time when Buddha started on the mission of his life.

The Aryan Community of his time was steeped in the worst kind of debauchery: social, religious and spiritual.

To mention only a few of the social evils, attention may be drawn to gambling. Gambling had become as widespread among the Aryans as drinking.

Every king had a hall of gambling attached to his palace. Every king had an expert gambler in his employment as a companion to play with. King *Virat* had in his employment *Kank* as an expert gambler. Gambling was not merely a pastime with kings. They played with heavy stakes. They staked kingdoms, dependents, relatives, slaves, servants.<sup>1</sup> King *Nala* staked everything in gambling with *Paskkqr* and lost everything. The only thing he did not stake was himself and his wife *Damayanti*. *Nala* had to go and live in the forest as a beggar. There were kings who went beyond *Nala*. The *Mahabharat*<sup>2</sup> tells how *Dharma* the eldest of the *Pandavas* gambled and staked everything,

<sup>1</sup> *Mahabharat*—*Vanparva*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*—*Sabhaparva*.

his brothers and also his and their wife Draupadi. Gambling was a matter of honour with the Aryans and any invitation to gamble was regraded as an injury to one's honour and dignity. Dharma gambled with such disastrous consequences although he was warned beforehand. His excuse was that he was invited to gamble and that as a man of honour he could not decline such an invitation.

This vice of gambling was not confined to kings. It had infected even the common folk. Rig-Veda contains lamentations of a poor Aryan ruined by gambling. The habit of gambling had become so common in Kautilya's time that there were gambling houses licensed by the king from which the king derived considerable revenue.

Drinking was another evil which was rampant among the Aryans. Liquors were of two sorts *Soma* and *Sura*. *Soma* was a sacrificial wine. The drinking of the *Soma* was in the beginning permitted only to Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas. Subsequently it was permitted only to Brahmins and Kshatriyas. The Vaishyas were excluded from it and the Shudras were never permitted to taste it. Its manufacture was a secret known only to the Brahmins. *Sura* was open to all and was drunk by all. The Brahmins also drank *Sura*. Shukracharya<sup>1</sup> the priest to the *Asuras* drank so heavily that in his drunken state he gave the life-giving *Mantras*—known to him only and with which he used to revive the *Asuras* killed by the *Devas*—to *Katch* the son of *Brahaspati* who was the priest of the *Devas*. The Mahabharat mentions an occasion when both *Krishna* and *Arjuna* were dead drunk. That shows that the best among the Aryan Society were not only not free from the drink habit but that they drank heavily. The most shameful part of it was that even the Aryan women were addicted to drink. For instance *Sudeshna*<sup>2</sup> the wife of king *Virat* tells her maid *Sairandhri* to go to *Kichaka's* palace and bring *Sura* as she was dying to have a drink. It is not to be supposed that only queens indulged in drinking. The habit of drinking was common among women of all classes and even Brahmin women were not free from it.<sup>3</sup> That liquor and dancing was indulged in by the Aryan women is clear from the *Kausitaki Grihya Sutra* I. 11-12, which says, "Four or eight women who are not widowed after having been regaled with wine and food are to dance for four times on the night previous to the wedding ceremony."

<sup>1</sup> Mahabharat.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Viratparva Ad. XV. 10.

<sup>3</sup> That the drinking of intoxicating liquor was indulged in by Brahmin women, not to speak of women of the lower *Varnas*, as late as the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. in the Central region of Aryavarta, is clear from Kumarila Bhatta's *Tantra-Vartika* I (iii). 4, which states, "Among the people of modern days we find the Brahmin women of the countries of Ahicchatra and Mathura to be addicted to drinking." Kumarila condemned the practice in the case of Brahmins only, but not of Kshatriyas and Vaishyas men and women if the liquor was distilled from fruits or flowers (Madhavi), and Molasses (Gaudi) and not from grains (*Sura*).

Turning to the Aryan Society it was marked by class war and class degradation. The Aryan Society recognized four classes, the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. These divisions were not merely horizontal divisions, all on a par with each other in the matter of social relationship. These divisions, had become vertical, one above the other. Being placed above or below there was both jealousy and rivalry among the four classes. This jealousy and rivalry had given rise even to enmity. This enmity was particularly noticeable between the two highest classes, namely, the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas and there was a regular class war between the two, so intense that it would delight the heart of any Marxian to read the descriptions thereof. Unfortunately there is no detailed history of this class war between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas. Only a few instances have been recorded. Vena, Pururavas, Nahusha, Sudas, Sumukh and Nimi were some of the Kshatriya kings who came into the conflict with the Brahmins. The issues in these conflicts were different.

The issue between Vena and the Brahmins was whether a King could command and require the Brahmins to worship him and offer sacrifice to him instead of the Gods. The issue between Pururavas and the Brahmins was whether a Kshatriya King could confiscate the property of the Brahmin. The issue between Nahusha and the Brahmins was whether a Kshatriya king could order a Brahmin to do a servile job. The issue between Nimi and the Brahmins was whether the king was bound to employ only his family priest at the sacrificial ceremony. The issue between Sudas and the Brahmins was whether the king was bound to employ only a Brahmin as a priest.

This shows how big were the issues between the two classes. No wonder that the struggle between them was also the bitterest. The wars between them were not merely occasional riots. They were wars of extermination. It is stated that Parashuram a Brahmin fought against the Kshatriyas twenty-one times and killed every Kshatriya.

While the two classes were fighting among themselves for supremacy, they both combined to keep down the Vaishyas and the Shudras. The Vaishya was a milch cow. He lived only to pay taxes. The Shudra was a general beast of burden. These two classes existed for the sole purpose of making the life of the Brahmins and Kshatriyas glorious and happy. They had no right to live for themselves. They lived to make the life of their betters possible.

Below these two classes there were others. They were the Chandalas and Shwappakas. They were not untouchables but they were degraded. They were outside the pale of society and outside the pale of law. They had no rights and no opportunities. They were the rejects of the Aryan Society.

The sexual immorality of the Aryan Society must shock their present day descendants. The Aryans of pre-Buddhist days had no such rule of prohibited degrees as we have today to govern their sexual or matrimonial relationship.

According to the Aryan Mythology, Brahma is the creator. Brahma had three sons and a daughter. His one son Daksha married his sister. The daughters born of this marriage between brother and sister were married some to Kashyapa the son of Marichi the son of Brahma and some to Dharma the third son of Brahma.<sup>1</sup>

In the Rig-Veda there is an episode related of Yama and Yami brother and sister. According to this episode Yami the sister invites her brother Yama to cohabit with her and becomes angry when he refuses to do so.<sup>2</sup>

A father could marry his daughter. *Vashishta* married his own daughter *Shatrupa* when she came of age.<sup>3</sup> *Manu* married his daughter *Ila*.<sup>4</sup> *Janhu* married his daughter *Janhavi*.<sup>5</sup> *Surya* married his daughter *Usha*.<sup>6</sup> There was polyandri not of the ordinary type. The polyandri prevalent among the Aryans was a polyandri when Kinsmen cohabited with one woman. *Dhahaprachetani* and his son *Soma* cohabited with *Marisha* the daughter of *Soma*.<sup>7</sup>

Instances of grandfather marrying his grand-daughter are not wanting. Daksha gave his daughter in marriage to his father Brahma<sup>8</sup> and from that marriage was born the famous Narada. Dauhitra gave his 27 daughters to his father Soma for cohabitation and procreation.<sup>9</sup>

The Aryans did not mind cohabiting with women in the open and within sight of people. The Rishis used to perform certain religious rites which were called Vamdevya vrata. These rites used to be performed on the Yadnya Bhumi. If any woman came there and expressed a desire for sexual intercourse and asked the sage to satisfy her, the sage used to cohabit with her then and there in the open on the Yadnya Bhumi. Instances of this may be mentioned; the case of the sage Parashara who had sexual intercourse with Satyavati and also of Dirghatapa. That such a custom was common is shown by the existence of the word Ayoni. The word Ayoni is understood to mean of immaculate conception. That is not however the original meaning of the word. The original meaning of the word Yoni is house. Ayoni

<sup>1</sup> Mahabharata Adiparva. Adh. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Rig Veda.

<sup>3</sup> Harivansha Adh. II..

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* Adh. X.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* Adh. XXVII.

<sup>6</sup> Yask Nirukta Adh. V. Khanda VI.

<sup>7</sup> Harivansha Adh. II.

<sup>8</sup> Harivansha Adh. III.

<sup>9</sup> .

means conceived out of the house i.e. in the open. That there was nothing deemed to be wrong in this is clear from the fact that both Sita and Draupadi were Ayonija. That this was very common is clear from the fact that religious injunctions had to be issued against such a practice.<sup>1</sup>

There was prevalent among the Aryans the practice of renting out their women to others for a time. As an illustration may be mentioned the story of Madhavi<sup>2</sup> The king Yayati gave his daughter Madhavi as an offering to his guru Galav. Galav rented out the girl Madhavi to three kings each a period. Thereafter he gave her in marriage to Vishwamitra. She remained with him until a son was born to her. Thereafter Galav took away the girl and gave her back to her father Yayati.

Besides the practice of letting out women to others temporarily at a rent, there was prevalent among the Aryans another practice namely, allowing procreation by the best amongst them. Raising a family was treated by them as though it was a breeding or stock raising. Among the Aryas there was a class of persons called *Devas* who were Aryans but of a superior status and prowess. The Aryans allowed their women to have sexual intercourse with any one of the class of *Devas* in the interest of good breeding. This practice prevailed so extensively that the *Devas* came to regard prelibation in respect of the Aryan women as their prescriptive right. No Aryan woman could be married unless this right of prelibation had been redeemed and the woman released from the control of the *Devas* by offering what was technically called *Avadan*. The *Laja Hoame* which is performed in every Hindu marriage and the details of which are given in the *Ashwalayan Grahya Sutra* is a relic of this act of the redemption of the Aryan woman from the right of prelibation of the *Devas*. The *Avadan* in the *Laja Hoame* is nothing but the price for the extinguishment of the right of the *Devas* over the bride. The *Saptapadi* performed in all Hindu marriages and which is regarded as the most essential ceremony without which there is no lawful marriage has an integral connection with this right of prelibation of the *Devas*. *Saptapadi* means walking by the bridegroom seven steps with the bride. Why is this essential? The answer is that the *Devas* if they were dissatisfied with the compensation could claim the woman before the seventh step was taken. After the seventh step was taken, the right of the *Devas* was extinguished and the bridegroom could take away the bride and live as husband and wife without being obstructed or molested by the *Devas*.

<sup>1</sup> Mahabharat Adi Parva—Adh. 193.

<sup>2</sup> Mahabharat Udyoga parva. Adh. 106-123.



There was no rule of chastity for maidens. A girl could have sexual intercourse with and also progeny from anybody without contracting marriage. This is evident from the root meaning of the word *Kanya* which means a girl. *Kanya* comes from the root *Kam* which means a girl free to offer herself to any man. That they did offer themselves to any man and had children without contracting regular marriage is illustrated by the case of *Kunti* and *Matsyagandha*. *Kunti* had children from different men before she was married to *Pandu* and *Matsyagandha* had sexual intercourse with the sage *Parashara* before she was married to *Shantanu* the father of *Bhishma*.

Beastiality was also prevalent among the Aryans. The story of the sage *Dam* having sexual intercourse with a female deer<sup>1</sup> is well known. Another instance is that of *Surya* cohabiting with a mare<sup>2</sup>. But the most hideous instance is that of the woman having sexual intercourse with the horse in the *Ashvamedha Yajna*.

The religion of the Aryan consisted of the *Yajna* or sacrifice. The sacrifice was a means to enter into the godhead of the gods, and even to control the gods. The traditional sacrifices were twenty one in number divided into three classes of seven each. The first were sacrifices of butter, milk, corn, etc. The second class covered *Soma* sacrifices and third animal sacrifices. The sacrifice may be of short duration or long duration lasting for a year or more. The latter was called a *Sattra*. The argument in favour of the sacrifice is that eternal holiness is won by him that offers the sacrifice. Not only a man's self but also his Manes stood to benefit by means of sacrifice. He gives the Manes pleasure with his offering, but he also raises their estate, and sends them up to live in a higher world.<sup>3</sup>

The sacrifice was by no means meant as an aid to the acquirement of heavenly bliss alone. Many of the great sacrifices were for the gaining of good things on earth. That one should sacrifice without the ulterior motive of gain is unknown. Brahmanic India knew no thank offering. Ordinarily the gain is represented as a compensating gift from the divinity, whom they sacrifice. The sacrifice began with the recitation: "He offers the sacrifice to the god with this text: 'Do thou give to me (and) I (will) give to thee; do thou bestow on me (and) I (will) bestow on thee'."

The ceremony of the sacrifice was awe-inspiring. Every word was pregnant with consequences and even the pronunciation of the word or accent was fateful. There are indications, however, that the priest themselves understood that, much in the ceremonial was pure hocus-pocus, and not of much importance as it was made out to be.

<sup>1</sup> Mahabharat Adhyaya I-118.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Adhyaya 66.

<sup>3</sup> This is taken from Hopkins—The Religions of India.

Every sacrifice meant fee to the priest. As to fee, the rules were precise and their propounders were unblushing. The priest performed the sacrifice for the fee alone, and it must consist of valuable garments, kine, horses or gold—when each was to be given was carefully stated. The priests had built up a great complex of forms, where at every turn fees were demanded. The whole expense, falling on one individual for whose benefit the sacrifice was performed, must have been enormous. How costly the whole thing became can be seen from the fact that in one place the fee for the sacrifice is mentioned as one thousand cows. For this greed, which went so far that he proclaimed that he who gives a thousand cows obtains all things of heaven. The priest had a good precedent to cite, for, the gods of heaven, in all tales told of them, ever demand a reward from each other when they help their neighbour gods. If the Gods seek rewards, the priest has a right to do the same.

The principal sacrifice was the animal sacrifice. It was both costly and barbaric. In the Aryan religion there are five sacrificial animals mentioned. In this list of sacrificial animals man came first. The sacrifice of a man was the costliest. The rules of sacrifice required that the individual to be slaughtered must be neither a priest nor a slave. He must be a Kshatriya or Vaishya. According to the ordinary valuation of those times the cost of buying a man to be sacrificed was one thousand cows. Besides being costly and barbaric, it must have been revolting because the sacrificers had not only to kill the man but to eat him. Next to man came the horse. That also was a costly sacrifice because the horse was a rare and a necessary animal for the Aryans in their conquest of India. The Aryans could hardly afford such a potent instrument of military domination to be offered as sacrifice. The sacrifice must have been revolting in as much as one of the rituals in the horse-sacrifice was the copulation of the horse before it was slaughtered with the wife of the sacrificer.

The animals most commonly offered for sacrifice were of course the cattle which were used by the people for their agricultural purposes. They were mostly cows and bullocks.

The Yadnas were costly and they would have died out of sheer considerations of expense involved. But they did not. The reason is that the stoppage of Yadna involved the question of the loss of the Brahmin's fees. There could be no fees if the Yadna ceased to be performed and the Brahmin would starve. The Brahmin therefore found a substitute for the costly sacrificial animals. For a human sacrifice the Brahmin allowed as a substitute for a live man, a man of straw or metal or earth. But they did not altogether give up human sacrifice for fear that this Yadna might be stopped and they should

lose their fees. When human sacrifice became rare, animal sacrifice came in as a substitute. Animal sacrifice was also a question of expense to the laity. Here again rather than allow the sacrifice to go out of vogue, the Brahmins came forward with smaller animals for cattle just as cattle had been allowed to take the place of the man and the horse. All this was for the purpose of maintaining the *Yadna* so that the Brahmin did not lose his fees which was his maintenance. So set were the Brahmins on the continuance of the *Yadna* that they were satisfied with merely rice as an offering.

It must not however be supposed that the institution of substitutes of the *Yadnas* of the Aryans had become less horrid. The introduction of substitutes did not work as a complete replacement of the more expensive and more ghastly sacrifice by the less expensive and the more innocent. All that it meant was that the offering may be according to the capacity of the sacrificer. If he was poor his offering may be rice. If he was well to do it might be a goat. If he was rich it might be a man, horse, cow or a bull. The effect of the substitutes was that the *Yadna* was brought within the capacity of all so that the Brahmin reaped a larger harvest of feast on the total. It did not have the effect of stopping animal sacrifice. Indeed animals continued to be sacrificed by the thousands.

The *Yadna* often became a regular carnage of cattle at which the Brahmins did the work of butchers. One gets some idea of the extent of this carnage of innocent animals from references to the *Yadnas* which one comes across in Buddhist literature. In the *Suttanipat* a description is given of the *Yadna* that was arranged to be performed by Pasenadi, king of Kosala. It is stated that there were tied to the poles for slaughter at the *Yadna* five hundred oxen, five hundred bulls, five hundred cows, five hundred goats and five hundred lambs and that the servants of the king who were detailed to do the jobs according to the orders given to them by the officiating Brahmin priests were doing their duties with tears in their eyes.

The *Yadna* besides involving a terrible carnage was really a kind of carnival. Besides roast meat there was drink. The Brahmins had Soma as well as Sura. The others had Sura in abundance. Almost every *Yadna* was followed by gambling and what is most extraordinary is that, side by side there went on also sexual intercourse in the open. *Yadna* had become debauchery and there was no religion left in it.

The Aryan religion was just a series of observances. Behind these observances there was no yearning for a good and a virtuous life. There was no hunger or thirst for righteousness. Their religion was without any spiritual content. The hymns of the *Rig Veda* furnish very

good evidence of the absence of any spiritual basis for the Aryan religion. The hymns are prayers addressed by the Aryans to their gods. What do they ask for in these prayers? Do they ask to be kept away from temptation? Do they ask for deliverance from evil? Do they ask for forgiveness of sins? Most of the hymns are in praise of Indra. They praise him for having brought destruction to the enemies of the Aryans. They praise him because he killed all the pregnant wives of Krishna, an Asura. They praise him because he destroyed hundreds of villages of the Asuras. They praise him because he killed lakhs of Dasyus. The Aryans pray to Indra to carry on greater destruction among the Anaryas in the hope that they may secure to themselves the food supplies of the Anaryas and the wealth of the Anaryas. Far from being spiritual and elevating, the hymns of the Rig-Veda are saturated with wicked thoughts and wicked purposes. The Aryan religion never concerned itself with what is called a righteous life.

## II

Such was the state of the Aryan Society when Buddha was born. There are two pertinent questions regarding Buddha as a reformer who laboured to reform the Aryan Society. What were the chief planks in his reform? To what extent did he succeed in his reform movement?

To take up the first question.

Buddha felt that for the inculcation of a good and a pure life, example was better than precept. The most important thing he did was to lead a good and a pure life so that it might serve as a model to all. How unblemished a life he led can be gathered from the *Brahma-Jala Sutta*. It is reproduced below because it not only gives an idea of the pure life that Buddha led but it also gives an idea of how impure a life the Brahmins, the best among the Aryans led.

### **Brahma Jala Sutta**

1. Thus have I heard. The Blessed One was once going along the high road between Rajagaha and Nalanda with a great company of the brethren with about five hundred brethren. And Suppiya the mendicant too was going along the high road between Rajagaha and Nalanda with his disciple the young Brahmadatta. Now just then Suppiya the mendicant was speaking in many ways in dispraise of the Buddha, in dispraise of the Doctrine, in dispraise of the Order. But young Brahmadatta, his pupil, gave utterance, in many ways, to praise of the Buddha, to praise of the Doctrine, to praise of the Order. Thus they two, teacher and pupil, holding opinions in direct contradiction of one to the other, were following, step by step, after the Bleased one and the company of the brethren.

2. Now the Blessed one put up at the royal rest-house in the Ambalatthika pleasance to pass the night, and with him the company of the brethren. And so also did Suppiya the mendicant, and with him his young disciple Brahmadata. And there, at the rest-houses, these two carried on the same discussion as before.

3. And in the early dawn a number of the brethren assembled as they rose up, in the pavilion; and this was the trend of the talk that sprang up among them, as they were seated there. 'How wonderful a thing is it, brethren, and how strange that the Blessed One, he who knows and sees, the Arahata, the Buddha Supreme, should so clearly have perceived how various are the inclination of men! For see how while Suppiya the mendicant speaks in many ways in dispraise of the Buddha, the Doctrine, and the Order, his own disciple, young Brahmadata, speaks, in as many ways, in praise of them. So do these two, teacher and pupil, follow step by step after the Blessed One and the company of the brethren, giving utterance to views in direct contradiction of one to the other.

4. Now the Blessed One, on realising what was the drift of their talk, went to the pavilion, and took his seat on the mat spread out for him. And when he had sat down he said: "What is the talk on which you are engaged sitting here, and what is the subject of the conversation between you?" And they told him all. And he said:

5. Brethren, if outsiders should speak against me, or against the Doctrine, or against the Order, you should not on that account either bear malice, or suffer heart-burning, or feel ill-will. If you, on that account, should be angry and hurt, that would stand in the way of your own self-conquest. If, when others speak against us, you feel angry at that, and displeased, would you then be able to judge how far that speech of theirs is well said or ill?

'That would not be so, Sir.'

'But when outsiders speak in dispraise of me, or of the Doctrine, or of the Order, you should unravel what is false and point it out as wrong, saying: "For this or that reason this is not the fact, that is not so, such a thing is not found among us, is not in us."

6. But also, brethren, if outsiders should speak in praise of me, in praise of the Doctrine, in praise of the Order, you should not, on that account, be filled with pleasure or gladness, or be lifted up in heart. Were you to be so that also would stand in the way of your self-conquest. When outsiders speak in praise of me, or of the Doctrine, or of the Order, you should acknowledge what is right to be the fact, saying: "For this or that reason this is the fact, that is so, such a thing is found among us, is in us."

7. It is in respect only of trifling things, of matters of little value, of mere morality, that an unconverted man, when praising the Tathagata, would speak. And what are such trifling, minor details of mere morality that he would praise?

(4) (The Moralities. Part I).

8. "Putting away the killings of living things, Gotama the recluse holds aloof from the destruction of life. He has laid the cudgel and the sword aside, and ashamed of roughness, and full of mercy, he dwells compassionate and kind to all creatures that have life." It is thus that the unconverted man, when speaking in praise of the Tathagata, might speak.

Or he might say: "Putting away the taking of what has not been given, Gotama the recluse lived aloof from grasping what is not his own. He takes only what is given, and expecting that gifts will come, he passes his life in honesty and purity of heart."

Or he might say: "Putting away unchastity, Gotama the recluse is chaste. He holds himself aloof, far off, from the vulgar practice, from the sexual act."

9. Or he might say: "Putting away lying words, Gotama the recluse holds himself aloof from falsehood. He speaks truth from the truth he never swerves; faithful and trustworthy, he breaks not his word to the world".

Or he might say: "Putting away slander, Gotama the recluse holds himself aloof from calumny. What he hears here he repeats not elsewhere to raise a quarrel against the people here; what he hears elsewhere he repeats not here to raise a quarrel against the people there. Thus does he live as a binder together of those who are divided, an encourager of those who are friends, a peacemaker, a lover of peace, impassioned for peace, a speaker of words that make for peace."

Or he might say: "Putting away rudeness of speech, Gotama the recluse holds himself aloof from harsh language. Whatsoever word is blameless, pleasant to the ear, lovely, reaching to the heart, urbane, pleasing to the people, beloved of the people—such are words he speaks."

Or he might say: "Putting away frivolous talk, Gotama the recluse holds himself aloof from vain conversation. In season he speaks, in accordance with the facts, words full of meaning, on religion, on the discipline of the Order. He speaks, and at the right time, words worthy to be laid up in one's heart, fitly illustrated, clearly divided, to the point."

10. Or he might say: "Gotama the recluse holds himself aloof from causing injury to seeds or plants.

He takes but one meal a day, not eating at night, refraining from food after hours (after midday).

He refrains from being a spectator at shows at fairs with nautch dances, singing, and music.

He abstains from wearing, adorning, or ornamenting himself with garlands, scents, and unguents.

He abstains from the use of the large and lofty beds.

He abstains from accepting silver or gold.

He abstains from accepting uncooked grain.

He abstains from accepting raw meat.

He abstains from accepting women or girls.

He abstains from accepting bondmen or bond-women.

He abstains from accepting sheep or goats.

He abstains from accepting fowls or swine.

He abstains from accepting elephants, cattle, horses and mare.

He abstains from accepting cultivated fields or waste.

He abstains from the acting as a go-between or messenger.

He abstains from buying and selling.

He abstains from cheating with scales or bronzes or measures.

He abstains from the crooked ways of bribery, cheating, and fraud.

He abstains from maiming, murder, putting in bonds, highway robbery, dacoity, and violence."

Such are the things, brethren, which an unconverted man, when speaking in praise of the Tathagata might say.'

.....

Here ends the Kula Sila (the Short Paragraphs on Conduct).

.....

11. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to the injury of seedlings and growing plants whether propagated from roots or cuttings or joints or buddings or seeds—Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such injury to seedlings and growing plants."

12. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to the use of the things stored up; stores, to wit, of foods, drinks, clothing, equipages, bedding, perfumes, and curry-stuffs—Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such use of things stored up."

13. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to visiting shows; that is to say,

- (1) Nautch dances (nakkam),
- (2) Singings of songs (gitam)
- (3) Instrumental music (vaditam)
- (4) Shows at fairs (pekham)
- (5) Ballads recitations (akkhanam)
- (6) Hand music (paniseram)
- (7) The chanting of bards (vetala)
- (8) Tam-tam playing (kumbhathunam)
- (9) Fair scences (sobhanagarkam)
- (10) Acrobatic feats by Kandalas (Kandala-vamsa-dhopanam)
- (11) Combats of elephants, horses, buffaloes, bulls, goats, rams, cocks and quails.
- (12) Bouts at quarterstaff, boxing, wrestling.
- (13)-(16) Sham-fights, roll-calls, manoeuvres, reviews.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from visiting such shows."

14. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans, while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to games and recreations; that is to say,

- (1) Games on boards with eight, or with ten, rows of squares.
- (2) The same games played by imagining such boards in the air.
- (3) Keeping going over diagrams drawn on the ground so that one steps only where one ought to go.
- (4) Either removing the pieces or men from a heap with one's nail, or putting them into a heap, in each case without shaking it. He who shakes the heap, loses.
- (5) Throwing dice.
- (6) Hitting a short stick with a long one.
- (7) Dipping the hand with the fingers stretched out in lac, or red dye, or flour water, and striking the wet hand on the ground or on a wall, calling out 'What shall it be?' and showing the form requires—elephants, horses etc.,
- (8) Games with balls.
- (9) Blowing through toy pipes made of leaves.
- (10) Ploughing with toy ploughs.
- (11) Turning summersaults.
- (12) Playing with toy windmills made of palm leaves.
- (13) Playing with toy measures made of palm leaves.
- (14, 15) Playing with toy carts or toy bows.
- (16) Guessing at letters traced in the air, or on a playfellow's back.
- (17) Guessing the playfellow's thoughts.
- (18) Mimicry of deformities.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such games and recreations."



15. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans, while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to the use of high and large couches; that is to say,

- (1) Moveable settees, high, and six feet long (Asandi).
- (2) Divans with animal figures carved on the supports (Pallanko).
- (3) Goats' hair coverings with very long fleece (Ganako).
- (4) Patchwork counterpanes of many colours (Kittaka).
- (5) White blankets (Patika).
- (6) Woollen coverlets embroidered with flowers (Patalika).
- (7) Quilts stuffed with cotton wood (Tulika).
- (8) Coverlets embroidered with figures of lions, tigers, &c., (Vikatika).
- (9) Rugs with fur on both sides (Uddalomi).
- (10) Rugs with fur on one side (Ekantalomi).
- (11) Coverlets embroidered with gems (Katthissam).
- (12) Silk coverlets (Koseyyam).
- (13) Carpets large enough for sixteen dancers (Kuttakam).
- (14-16) Elephant, horse, and chariot rugs.
- (17) Rugs of antelope skins sewn together (Aginapaveni).
- (18) Rugs of skins of the plantain antelope.
- (19) Carpets with awnings above them (Sauttarakkhadam).
- (20) Sofas with red pillows for the head and feet."

16. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans, while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to the use of means for adorning and beautifying themselves: that is to say:

Rubbing in scented powders on one's body, shampooing it, and bathing it. Patting the limbs with clubs after the manner of wrestlers. The use of mirrors, eye-ointments, garlands, rouge, cosmetics, bracelets, necklaces, walking-sticks, reed cases for drugs, rapiers, sunshades, embroidered slippers, turbans, diadems, whisks of the yak's tail, and long-fringed white robes.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such means of adorning and beautifying the person."

17. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to such low conversation as these:

Tales of kings, of robbers, of ministers of state: tales of war, of terrors, of battles; talk about foods and drinks, clothes, beds, garlands, perfumes; talks about relationships, equipages, villages, towns, cities, and countries; tales about women, and about heroes; gossip at street corners, or places whence water is fetched; ghost stories; ~~desultory~~

talk; speculations about the creation of the land or sea, or about existence and non-existence.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such low conversation."

18. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to the use of wrangling phrases: such as:

"You don't understand this doctrine and discipline, I do."

"How should you know about this doctrine and discipline?"

"You have fallen into wrong views. It is I who am in the right."

"I am speaking to the point, you are not."

"You are putting last what ought to come first, and first what ought to come last."

"What you've excogitated so long, that's all quite upset."

"Your challenge has been taken up."

"You are proved to be wrong."

"Set to work to clear your views."

"Disentangle yourself if you can."

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such wrangling phrases."

19. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to taking messages, going on errands, and acting as go-betweens; to wit, on kings, ministers of state, Kshatriyas, Brahmins, or young men, saying: 'Go there, come hither, take this with you, bring that from thence.'

Gotama the recluse abstains from such servile duties."

20. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, are tricksters, droners out (of holy words for pay), diviners, and exorcists, ever hungering to add gain to gain.

Gotam the recluse holds aloof from such deception and patter."

Here ends the Majjhima Sila (the Longer Paragraphs on Conduct).

.....

21. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmins, while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of livelihood, by low arts, such as these:

(1) Palmistry—prophesying long life, prosperity, &c., (or the reverse), from marks on a child's hands, feet, &c.

(2) Divining by means of omens and signs.

(3) Auguries drawn from thunderbolts and other celestial portents.

(4) Prognostication by interpreting dreams.

(5) Fortune-telling from marks on the body.

- (6) Auguries from the marks on cloth gnawed by mice.
- (7) Sacrificing to Agni.
- (8) Offering oblations from a spoon.
- (9-13) Making offerings to gods of husks, of the red powder between the grain and the husk, of husked grain ready for boiling, of ghee and of oil.
- (14) Sacrificing by spewing mustard seeds, &c., into the fire out of one's mouth.
- (15) Drawing blood from one's right knee as a sacrifice to the gods.
- (16) Looking at the knuckles, &c., and, after muttering a charm, divining whether a man is well born of luck or not.
- (17) Determining whether the site, for a proposed house or pleasure, is lucky or not.
- (18) Advising on customary law.
- (19) Laying demons in a cemetery.
- (20) Laying ghosts.
- (21) Knowledge of the charms to be used when lodging in an earth house.
- (22) Snake charming.
- (23) The poison craft.
- (24) The scorpion craft.
- (25) The mouse craft.
- (26) The bird craft.
- (27) The crow craft.
- (28) Foretelling the number of years that a man has yet to live.
- (29) Giving charms to ward off arrows.
- (30) The animal wheel.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such low arts."

22. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of livelihood, by low arts, such as these:

Knowledge of the signs of good and bad qualities in the following things, and of the marks in them denoting the health or luck of their owners: to wit, gems, staves, garments, swords, arrows, bows, other weapons, women, men, boys, girls, slaves, slave-girls, elephants, horses, buffaloes, bulls, oxen, goats, sheep, fowls, quails, iguanas, herrings, tortoises, and other animals.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such low arts."

23. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans, while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by

wrong means of livelihood by low arts, such as soothsaying to the effect that:

The chiefs will march out.

The home chiefs will attack, and the enemies retreat.

The enemies' chiefs will attack, and ours will retreat.

The home chiefs will gain the victory, and ours will suffer defeat.

The foreign chiefs will gain the victory on this side, and ours will suffer defeat.

Thus will there be victory on this side, defeat on that.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such low arts."

24. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans, while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of livelihood, by such low arts as foretelling:

(1) There will be an eclipse of the Moon.

(2) There will be an eclipse of the Sun.

(3) There will be an eclipse of a Star (Nakshatra).

(4) There will be aberration of the Sun or the Moon.

(5) The Sun or the Moon will return to its usual path.

(6) There will be aberrations of the Stars.

(7) The Stars will return to their usual course.

(8) There will be a fall of meteors.

(9) There will be a jungle fire.

(10) There will be an earthquake.

(11) The God will thunder.

(12-15) There will be rising and setting, clearness and dimness of the Sun or the Moon or the stars, or foretelling of each of these fifteen phenomena that they will betoken such and such a result."

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such low arts.

25. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans, while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of the livelihood, by low arts, such as these:

Foretelling an abundant rainfall.

Foretelling a deficient rainfall.

Foretelling a good harvest.

Foretelling scarcity of food.

Foretelling tranquility.

Foretelling disturbances.

Foretelling a pestilence.

Foretelling a healthy season.

Counting on the fingers.

Counting without using the fingers.

Summing up large totals.

Composing ballads, poetizing.

Casuistry, sophistry.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such low arts."

26. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans, while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of livelihood, by low arts, such as:

- (1) Arranging a lucky day for marriages in which the bride or bridegroom is brought home.
- (2) Arranging a lucky day for marriages in which the bride or bridegroom is sent forth.
- (3) Fixing a lucky time for the conclusion of treaties of peace (or using charms to procure harmony)
- (4) Fixing a lucky time for the outbreak of hostilities (or using charms to make discord).
- (5) Fixing a lucky time for the calling in of debts (or charms for success in throwing dice).
- (6) Fixing a lucky time for the expenditure of money (or charms to bring ill luck to an opponent throwing dice).
- (7) Using charms to make people lucky.
- (8) Using charms to make people unlucky.
- (9) Using charms to procure abortion.
- (10) Incantations to keep a man's jaws fixed.
- (11) Incantations to bring on dumbness.
- (12) Incantations to make a man throw up his hands.
- (13) Incantations to bring on deafness.
- (14) Obtaining oracular answers by means of the magic mirror.
- (15) Obtaining oracular answers through a girl possessed.
- (16) Obtaining oracular answers from a god.
- (17) The worship of the Sun.
- (18) The worship of the Great One.
- (19) Bringing forth flames from one's mouth.
- (20) Invoking Siri, the goddess of Luck.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such low arts."

27. Or he might say: "Whereas some recluses and Brahmans, while living on food provided by the faithful, earn their living by wrong means of livelihood, by low arts, such as these:

- (1) Vowing gifts to a god if a certain benefit be granted.
- (2) Praying such vows.
- (3) Repeating charms while lodging in an earth house.
- (4) Causing virility.
- (5) Making a man impotent.
- (6) Fixing on lucky sites for dwellings.

- (7) Consecrating sites.
- (8) Ceremonial rinsings of the mouth.
- (9) Ceremonial bathings.
- (10) Offering sacrifices.
- (11-14) Administering emetics and purgatives.
- (15) Purging people to relieve the head (that is by giving drugs to make people sneeze).
- (16) Oiling people's ears (either to make them grow or to heal sores on them).
- (17) Satisfying people's eyes (soothing them by dropping medicinal oils into them).
- (18) Administering drugs through the nose.
- (19) Applying collyrium to the eyes.
- (20) Giving medical ointment for the eyes.
- (21) Practising as an oculist.
- (22) Practising as a surgeon.
- (23) Practising as a doctor for children.
- (24) Administering roots and drugs.
- (25) Administering medicines in rotation.

Gotama the recluse holds aloof from such low arts."

'These brethren, are the trifling matters, the minor details of morality, of which the unconverted man, when praising the Tathagata, might speak.'

.....

Here end the Long Paragraphs on Conduct.

### III

This was indeed the highest standard for a moral life for an individual to follow. So high a standard of moral life was quite unknown to the Aryan Society of his day.

He did not stop merely with setting an example by leading a life of purity. He also wanted to mould the character of the ordinary men and women in society. For their guidance he devised a form of baptism which was quite unknown to the Aryan Society. The baptism consisted in the convert to Buddhism undertaking to observe certain moral precepts laid down by Buddha. These precepts are known as Panch Sila or the five precepts. They are; (1) Not to kill, (2) Not to steal, (3) Not to lie, (4) Not to be unchaste and (5) Not to drink intoxicants. These five precepts were of the laity. For the Monks there were five additional precepts: (6) Not to eat at forbidden times, (7) Not to dance, sing, or attend theatrical or other spectacles, (8) To abstain from the use of garlands, scents, and ornaments, (9) To abstain from the use of high or broad beds, and (10) Never to receive money.

These *Silas* or precepts formed the moral code which it was intended should regulate the thoughts and actions of men and women.

Of these the most important one was the precept not to kill. Buddha took care to make it clear that the precept did not merely mean abstention from taking life. He insisted that the precept must be understood to mean positive sympathy, good will, and love for every thing that breathes.....

He gave the same positives and extended content to other precepts. One of the Buddha's lay followers once reported to him the teaching of a non-Buddhist ascetic, to the effect that the highest ideal consisted in the absence of evil deeds, evil words, evil thoughts, and evil life. The Buddha's comment upon this is significant. "If, said he, "this were true, then every suckling child would have attained the ideal of life ..... life is knowledge of good and evil; and after that the exchange of evil deeds, words, thoughts, and life, for good ones. This is to be brought about only by a long and determined effort of the will" .....

Buddha's teachings were not merely negative. They are positive and constructive. Buddha was not satisfied with a man following his precepts. He insisted upon encouraging others to follow them. For example in the *Auguttara Nikaya* the Buddha is quoted as distinguishing between a good man and a very good man by saying that one who abstains from killing, stealing, unchastity, lying and drunkenness may be called good; but only he deserves to be called very good who abstains from these evil things himself and also instigates others to do the like.....

As has been well said the two cardinal virtues of Buddhism are love and wisdom.

How deeply he inculcated the practice of love as a virtue is clear from his own words. "As a mother at the risk of her life watches over her own child, her only child, so also let every one cultivate a boundless loving mind towards all beings. And let him cultivate good will towards, all the world, a boundless (loving) mind above and below and across, unobstructed, without hatred, without enmity. This way of living is the best in the world." So taught Buddha<sup>1</sup>.

"Universal pity, sympathy for all suffering beings, good will to every form of sentient life, these things characterized the Tathagath (Buddha) as they have few others of the sons of men; and he succeeded in a most surprising degree in handing on his point of view to his followers."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sutta Nipata.

Buddha held to the doctrine of wisdom as firmly as he did to the doctrine of love. He held that moral life began with knowledge and ended with wisdom. he "came to save the world, and his method for the accomplishment of this end was the destruction of ignorance and the dissemination of knowledge as to the true values of life and the wise way to live." Buddha did not arrogate to himself the power to save people. People had to do that for themselves. And the way to save lay through knowledge. So much insistence did he place upon knowledge that he did not think that morality without knowledge was virtue.

There are three things against which Buddha carried on a great campaign.

He repudiated the authority of the Vedas.....

Secondly he denounced the *Yadna* as a form of religion. The attitude of Buddha towards *Yadna* is well stated in the *Jatakamala* in the form of a story. The story runs thus:

### THE STORY OF THE SACRIFICE

Those whose hearts are pure do not act up to the enticement of the wicked. Knowing this, pure-hearted-ness is to be striven after. This will be taught by the following:

Long ago the Bodhisattva, it is said, was a king who had obtained his kingdom in the order of hereditary succession. He had reached this state as the effect of his merit, and ruled his realm in peace, not disturbed by any rival, his sovereignty being universally acknowledged. His country was free from any kind of annoyance, vexation or disaster, both his home relations and those with foreign countries being quite in every respect; and all his vessels obeyed his commands.

1. This monarch having subdued the passions, his enemies, felt no inclination for such profits as are to be blamed when enjoyed, but was with his whole heart intent on promoting the happiness of his subjects. Holding virtuous practice (*dharma*) the only purpose of his actions, he behaved like a Muni.

2. For he knew the nature of mankind, that people set a high value on imitating the behaviour of the highest. For this reason, being desirous of bringing about salvation for his subjects, he was particularly attached to the due performance of his religious duties.

3. He practised almsgiving, kept strictly the precepts of moral conduct (*sila*), cultivated forbearance, strove for the benefit of the creatures. His mild countenance being in accordance with his thoughts devoted to the happiness of his subjects, he appeared like the embodied *Dharma*.



Now it once happened that, though protected by his arm, his realm, both in consequence of the faulty actions of its inhabitants and inadvertance on the part of the angels charged with the care of rain, was afflicted in several districts by drought and the troublesome effects of such a disaster. Upon this the king, fully convinced that his plague had been brought about by the violation of righteousness by himself or his subjects, and taking much to heart the distress of his people, whose welfare was the constant object of his thoughts and cares, took the advice of men of acknowledged competence, who were reputed for their knowledge in matters of religion. So keeping counsel with the elders among the Brahmans, headed by his family priest (purohita) and his ministers, he asked them for some means of putting an end to that calamity. Now they believing a solemn sacrifice as is enjoined by the Veda to be a cause of abundant rain, explained to him that he must perform such a sacrifice of a frightful character, inasmuch as it requires the massacre of many hundreds of living beings. But after being informed of everything concerning such a slaughter as is prescribed for the sacrifice, his innate compassionateness forbade him to approve of their advice in his heart; yet out of civility, unwilling to offend them by harsh words of refusal, he slipped over this point, turning the conversation upon other topics. They, on the other hand, no sooner caught the opportunity of conversing with the king on matters of religion, than they once more admonished him to accomplish the sacrifice, for they did not understand his deeply hidden mind.

4. "You constantly take care not to neglect the proper time of performing your different royal duties, established for the sake of obtaining the possession of land and ruling it. The due order of these actions of yours is in agreement with the precepts of Righteousness (dharma).

5. "How then is this that you who (in all other respects) are so clever in the observance of the triad (of dharma, artha, and kama), bearing your bow to defend the good of your people, are so careless and almost sluggish as to that bridge to the world of the Devas, the name of which is 'sacrifice'?

6. "Like servants, the kings (your vassel) revere your commands, thinking them to be the surest gage of success. Now the time is come, O destroyer of your foes, to gather by means of sacrifice superior blessings, which are to procure for you a shining glory.

7, 8. 'Certainly, that holiness which is the requisite for a dikshita is already yours, by reason of your habitual practice of charity and your strictness in observing the restraint (of good conduct). Nevertheless, it

would be fit for you to discharge your debt to the Devas by such sacrifices as are the subject matter of the Veda. The deities being satisfied by duly and faultlessly performed sacrifice, honour the creatures in return by (sending) rain. Thus considering, take to mind the welfare of your subjects and your own, and consent to the performance of a regular sacrifice which will enhance your glory.'

Thereupon he entered upon this thought: 'Very badly guarded is my poor person indeed, being given in trust to such leaders. While faithfully believing and loving the law, I should uproot my virtue of tenderheartedness by reliance upon the words of others. For, truly.'

9. Those who are reputed among men to be the best refuge are the very persons who intend to do harm, borrowing their arguments from the Law. Alas! such a man who follows the wrong path shown by them, will soon find himself driven to straits, for he will be surrounded by evils.

10. What connections may there be, forsooth, between righteousness and injuring animals? How my residence in the world of the Devas or propitiation of the deities have anything to do with the murder of victims?

11, 12. The animal slaughtered according to the rites with the prescribed prayers, as if those sacred formulas were so many darts to wound it, goes to heaven, they say, and with this object it is killed. In this way that action is interpreted to be done according to the Law. Yet it is a lie. For how is it possible that in the next world one should reap the fruits of what has been done by others? And by what reason will the sacrificial animal mount to heaven, though he has not abstained from wicked actions, though he has not devoted himself to the practice of good ones, simply because he has been killed in sacrifice, and not on the ground of his own actions?

13. And should the victim killed in sacrifice really go to heaven, should we not expect the Brahmans to offer themselves to be immolated in sacrifice? A similar practice, however, is nowhere seen among them. Who, then, may take to heart the advice proffered by these counsellors?

14. As to the Celestials, should we believe that they who are wont to enjoy the fair ambrosia of incomparable scent, flavour, magnificence, and effective power, served to them by the beautiful Apsaras, would abandon it to delight in the slaughter of a pitiable victim, that they might feast on the omentum and such other parts of his body as are offered to them in sacrifice?

'Therefore, it is the proper time to act so and so.' Having thus made up his mind, the king feigned to be eager to undertake the sacrifice;

and in approval of their words he spoke to them in this manner; 'Verily, well protected am I, well gratified, having such counsellors as Your Lordships are, thus bent on securing my happiness! Therefore I will have a human sacrifice (*purushamedha*) of a thousand victims performed. Let my officials, each in his sphere of business, be ordered to bring together the requisites necessary for that purpose. Let also an inquiry be made of the most fitting ground whereon to raise the tents and other buildings for the *sattra*. Further, the proper time for the sacrifice must be fixed (by the astrologers) examining the auspicious lunar days, *karanas*, *muhurtas*, and constellations.' The *purohita* answered; 'In order to succeed in your enterprise, Your Majesty ought to take the *Avabhrittha* (final bath) at the end of one sacrifice; after which you may successively undertake the others. For if the thousand human victims were to be seized at once, your subjects, to be sure, would blame you and be stirred up to great agitation on their account.' These words of the *purohita* having been approved by the (other) Brahmins, the king replied: 'Do not apprehend the wrath of the people, Reverends. I shall take such measures as to prevent any agitation among my subjects.'

After this the king convoked an assembly of the townsmen and the landmen, and said: 'I intend to perform a human sacrifice of a thousand victims. But nobody behaving honestly is fit to be designated for immolation on my part. With this in mind, I give you this advice: Whomsoever of you I shall henceforward perceive transgressing the boundaries of moral conduct, despising my royal will, him I order to be caught to be a victim at my sacrifice, thinking such a one the stain of his family and a danger to my country. With the object of carrying this resolution into effect, I shall cause you to be observed by faultless and sharp-sighted emissaries, who have shaken off sleepy carelessness and will report to me concerning your conduct.'

Then the foremost of the assembly, folding their hands and bringing them to their foreheads, spoke:

15, 16. 'Your Majesty, all your actions tend to the happiness of your subjects, what reason can there be to despise you on that account? Even (God) *Brahma* cannot but sanction your behaviour. Your Majesty, who is the authority of the virtuous, be our highest authority. For this reason anything which pleases Your Majesty must please us too. Indeed, you are pleased with nothing else but our enjoyment and our good.'

After then, notables both of the town and the country had accepted his command in this manner; the king dispersed about his towns and all over his country, officers notified as such by their outward

appearance to the people, with the charge of laying hold of the evil doers, and everywhere he ordered proclamations to be made by beat of drum day after day, of this kind:

17. The King, a granter of security as he is, warrants safety to every one who constantly cultivates honesty and good conduct, in short, to the virtuous. yet, intending to perform a human sacrifice for the benefit of his subjects, he wants human victims by thousands to be taken out of those who delight in misconduct.

18. 'Therefore, whosoever henceforward, licentiously indulging in misbehaviour, shall disregard the command of our monarch, which is even observed by the kings, his vassals, shall be brought to the state as a sacrificial victim by the very force of his own actions, and people shall witness his miserable suffering, when he shall pine with pain, his body being fastened to the sacrificial post.'

When the inhabitants of that realms became aware of their king's careful search after evil-doers with the aim of destining them to be victims at his sacrifice—for they heard the most frightful royal proclamation day after day and saw the king's servants, who were appointed to look out for wicked people and to seize them, appearing every now and then everywhere—they abandoned their attachment to bad conduct, and grew intent on strictly observing the moral precepts and self-control. They avoided every occasion of hatred and enmity, and settling their quarrels and differences, cherished mutual love and mutual esteem. Obedience to the words of parents and teachers, a general spirit of liberality and sharing with others, hospitality, good manners, modesty, prevailed among them. In short, they lived as it were in the Krita Yuga.

19. The fear of death had awakened in them thoughts of the next world; the risk of tarnishing the honour of their families had stirred their care of guarding their reputation; the great purity of their hearts had strengthened their sense of shame. These factors being at work, people were soon distinguished by their spotless behaviour.

20. Even though every one became more than ever intent on keeping a righteous conduct, still the king's servants did not diminish their watchfulness in the pursuit of the evil-doers. This also contributed to prevent people from falling short of righteousness.

21. The king, learning from his emissaries this state of things in his realm, felt extremely rejoiced. He bestowed rich presents on those messengers as a reward for the good news they told him, and enjoined his ministers, speaking something like this:

22-24. 'The protection of my subjects is my highest desire, you know. Now, they have become worthy to be recipients of sacrificial

gifts, and it is for the purpose of my sacrifice that I have provided this wealth. Well, I intend to accomplish my sacrifice in the manner which I have considered to be the proper one. Let every one who wishes for money, that it may be fuel for his happiness, come and accept it from my hand to his heart's content. In this way the distress and poverty, which is vexing our country, may be soon driven out. Indeed, whenever I consider my own strong determination to protect my subjects and the great assistance I derive from you, my excellent companions in that task, it often seems to me as though those sufferings of my people, by exciting my anger, were burning in my mind like a blazing fire.'

The ministers accepted the royal command and anon went to execute it. They ordered alms-halls to be established in all villages, towns, and markets, likewise at all stations on the roads. This being done, they caused all who begged in order to satisfy their wants, to be provided day after day with a gift of those objects, just as had been ordered by the king.

25. So poverty disappeared, and the people, having received wealth from the part of the king, dressed and adorned with manifold and fine garments and ornaments, exhibited the splendour of festival days.

26. The glory of the king, magnified by the eulogies of the rejoiced recipients of his gifts, spread about in all directions in the same way, as the flowerdust of the lotuses carried forth by the small waves of a lake, extends itself over a larger and larger surface.

27. And after the whole people, in consequence of the wise measures taken by their ruler, had become intent on virtuous behaviour, the plagues and calamities, overpowered by the growth of all such qualities as conduce to prosperity, faded away, having lost their hold.

28. The seasons succeeded each other in due course, rejoicing everybody by their regularity, and like kings newly established, complying with the lawful order of things. Consequently the earth produced the various kinds of corn in abundance, and there was fulness of pure and blue water and lotuses in all waterbasins.

29. No epidemics afflicted mankind; the medicinal herbs possessed their efficacious virtues more than ever; monsoons blew in due time and regularly; the planets moved along in auspicious paths.

30. Nowhere there existed any danger to be feared, either from abroad, or from within, or such as might be caused by dangerous derangements of the elements. Continuing in righteousness and self-control, cultivating good behaviour and modesty, the people of that country enjoyed as it were the prerogatives of the Krita Yuga.

By the power, then, of the king performing his sacrifice in this manner in accordance with (the precepts of) the Law, the sufferings of the indigent were put to an end together with the plagues and calamities, and the country abounded in a prosperous and thriving population offering the pleasing aspect of felicity. Accordingly people never wearied of repeating benedictions on their king and extending his renown in all directions.

One day, one of the highest royal officials, whose heart had been inclined to the (True) Belief, spoke thus to the king: "This is a true saying, in truth.

31. "Monarchs, because they always deal with all kinds of business, the highest, the lowest, and the intermediate, by far surpass in their wisdom any wise men.

"For, Your Majesty, you have obtained the happiness of your subjects both in this world and in the next, as the effect of your sacrifice being performed in righteousness, free from the blameable sin of animal-slaughter. The hard times are all over and the sufferings of poverty have ceased, since men have been established in the precepts of good conduct. Why use many words? Your subjects are happy.

32. "The black antelope's skin which covers your limbs has the resemblance of the spot on the bright Moon's surface, nor can the natural loveliness of your demeanour be hindered by the restraint imposed on you by your being a dikshita. Your head, adorned with such hair-dress as is in compliance with the rites of the diksha, possesses no less lustre than when it was embellished with the splendour of the royal umbrella. And, last not least, by your largesses you have surpassed the renown and abated the pride of the famous performer of a hundred sacrifices.

33. "As a rule, Oh, you wise ruler, the sacrifice of those who long for the attainment of some good, is a vile act, accompanied as it is by injury done to living beings. Your sacrifice, on the contrary, this monument of your glory, is in complete accordance with your lovely behaviour and your aversion to vices.

34. "Oh! Happy are the subjects who have their protector in you! It is certain that no father could be a better guardian to his children."

Another said:

35. "If the wealthy practise charity, they are commonly impelled to do so by the hopes they put in the cultivation of that virtue; good conduct too, may be accounted for by the wish to obtain high regard among men or the desire of reaching heaven after death. But such a practice of both, as is seen in your skill in securing the benefit of others, cannot be found but in those who are accomplished both in

learning and in virtuous exertions." In such a way, then, those whose hearts are pure do not act up to the enticement of the wicked. Knowing this, pure-heartedness is to be striven after."

(In the spiritual lessons for princes, also this is to be said:

'Who to his subjects wishing good, himself exerts,

Thus brings about salvation, glory, happiness.

No other should be of a king the business'.

And it may be added as follows: '(The prince) who strives after material prosperity, ought to act in accordance with the precepts of religion, thinking, a religious conduct of his subjects to be the source of prosperity.'

Further this is here to be said: 'Injuring animals never tends to bliss, but charity, self-restraint, continence and the like have this power; for this reason he who longs for bliss must devote himself to these virtues. 'And also when discoursing on the Tathagata: 'In this manner the Lord showed his inclination to care for the interests of the world, when he was still in his previous existences.'

#### IV

Another powerful attack against Yadna is contained in his discourses known as Kutadanta Sutta. It is as follows:

#### THE WRONG SACRIFICE AND THE RIGHT

1. Thus have I heard. The Blessed One once, when going on a tour through Magadha, with a great multitude of the brethren, with about five hundred brethren, came to a Brahman village in Magadha called Khanumata. And there at Khanumata he lodged in the Ambalatthika pleasure.

Now at that time the Brahman Kutadanta was dwelling at Khanumata, a place teeming with life, with much grassland and woodland and water and corn, on a royal domain presented him by Seniya Bimbisara the king of Magadha, as a royal gift, with power over it as if he were the king.

And just then a great sacrifice was being got ready on behalf of Kutadanta the Brahman. And a hundred bulls, and a hundred steers, and a hundred heifers, and a hundred goats, and a hundred rams had been brought to the post for the sacrifice.

2. Now the Brahmans and householders of Khanumata heard the news of the arrival of the Samana Gotama. And they began to leave Khanumata in companies and in bonds to go to the Ambalatthika pleasure.

3. And just then Kutandanta the Brahman had gone apart to the upper terrace of his house for his siesta ; and seeing the people thus to go by, he asked his door-keeper the reason. And the doorkeeper told him.

4. Then Kutandanta thought : 'I have heard that the Samana Gotama understands about the successful performance of a sacrifice with its threefold method and its sixteen accessory instruments. Now I don't know all this, and yet I want to carry out a sacrifice. It would be well for me to go to the Samana Gotama, and ask him about it.'

So he sent his doorkeeper to the Brahmins and householders of Khanumata, to ask them to wait till he could go with them to call upon the Blessed One.

5. But there were at that time a number of Brahmins staying at Khanumata to take part in the great sacrifice. And when they heard this they went to Kutadanta, and persuaded him on the same grounds as the Brahmins had laid before Sonadanda, not to go. But he answered them in the same terms as Sonadanda had used to those Brahmins. Then they were satisfied, and went with him to call upon the Blessed One.

9. And when he was seated there Kutadanta the Brahman told the Blessed One what he had heard, and requested him to tell him about success in performing a sacrifice in its three modes and with its accessory articles of furniture of sixteen kinds.

'Well then, O Brahman, give ear and listen attentively and I will speak.'

'Very well, Sir,' said Kutadanta in reply ; and the Blessed One spoke as follows :

10. 'Long ago, O Brahman, there was a king by name Wide-realm (Maha Vigita), mighty, with great wealth and large property ; with stores of silver and gold, of aids to enjoyment, of goods and corn ; with his treasure-houses and his garners full. Now when King Wide-realm was once sitting alone in meditation, he became anxious at the thought : "I have in abundance all the good things a mortal can enjoy. The whole wide circle of the earth is mine by conquest to possess. 'Twere well if I were to offer a great sacrifice that should ensure me weal and welfare for many days."

And he had the Brahman, his chaplain, called ; and telling him all that he had thought, he said : "Be I would fain, O Brahman, offer a great sacrifice-let the venerable one instruct me how-for my weal and my welfare for many days."

11. Thereupon the Brahman who was chaplain said to the king : "The king's country, Sirs, is harrassed and harried. There are decoits



abroad who pillage the villages and townships, and who make the roads unsafe. Were the king, so long as that is so, to levy a fresh tax, verily his majesty would be acting wrongly. But perchance his majesty might think: 'I'll soon put a stop to these scoundrels' game by degradation and banishment, and fines and bonds and death!' But their license cannot be satisfactorily put a stop to. The remnant left unpunished would still go on harassing the realm. Now there is one method to adopt to put a thorough end to this disorder. Whosoever there be in the king's realm who devote themselves to keeping cattle and the farm, to them let his majesty the king give food and seed-corn. Whosoever there be in the king's realm who devote themselves to trade, to them let his majesty the king give capital. Whosoever there be in the king's realm who devote themselves to government service, to them let his majesty the king give wages and food. Then those men following each his own business, will no longer harass the realm; the king's revenue will go up; the country will be quiet and at peace; and the populace, pleased one with another and happy; dancing their children in their arms, will dwell with open doors."

'Then King Wide-realm, O Brahman, accepted the word of his chaplain, and did as he had said. And those men, following each his business, harassed the realm no more. And the King's revenue went up. And the country became quiet and at peace. And the populace pleased one with another and happy, dancing their children in their arms, dwelt with open doors.'

12. 'So King Wide-realm had his chaplain called, and said: "The disorder is at an end. The country is at peace. I want to offer that great sacrifice—let the venerable one instruct me how—for my weal and my welfare for many days."

'Then let his majesty the king send invitations to whomsoever there may be in his realm who are Kshatriyas, vassals of his, either in the country or the towns; or who are ministers and officials of his, either in the country or the towns; or who are Brahmans of position, either in the country or the towns; or who are householders of substance, either in the country or the towns, saying: "I intend to offer a great sacrifice. Let the venerable ones give their sanction to what will be to me for weal and welfare for many days."

'Then King Wide-realm, O Brahman, accepted the word of his chaplain, and did as he had said. And they each—Kshatriyas and ministers and Brahmans and householders—made alike reply: "Let his majesty the king celebrate the sacrifice. The time is suitable O King!"

'Thus did these four, as colleagues by consent, become wherewithal to furnish forth that sacrifice,

13. 'King Wide-realm was gifted in the following eight ways:

'He was well born on both sides, on the mother's side and on the father's, of pure descent back through seven generations, and no slur was cast upon him, and no reproach, in respect of birth.'

'He was handsome, pleasant in appearance, inspiring trust, gifted with great beauty of complexion, fair in colour, fine in presence, stately to behold.'

'He was mighty, with great wealth, and large property, with stores of silver and gold, of aids to enjoyment, of goods and corn, with his treasure-houses and his garner full.'

'He was powerful, in command of an army, loyal and disciplined in four divisions (of elephants, cavalry, chariots, and bowmen), burning up, methinks, his enemies by his very glory.'

'He was a believer, and generous, a noble giver, keeping open house, a well in spring whence Samanas and Brahmans, the poor and the wayfarers, beggars, and petitioners might draw, a doer of good deeds.'

'He was learned in all kinds of knowledge.'

'He knew the meaning of what had been said, and could explain, "This saying has such and such a meaning, and that such and such".'

'He was intelligent, expert and wise and able to think out things present or past or future.'

'And these eight gifts of his, too, became where withal to furnish forth that sacrifice.'

14. 'The Brahman, his chaplain was gifted in the following four ways:

'He was well born on both sides, on the mother's and on the father's, of pure descent back through seven generations, with no slur cast upon him, and no reproach in respect of birth.'

'He was a student repeater who knew the mystic verses by heart, master of the three Vedas, with the indices, the ritual, the phonology, and the exegesis (as a fourth), and the legends as a fifth, learned in the idioms and the grammar, versed in Lokayata (Mature-lore) and in the thirty marks on the body of a great man.'

'He was virtuous, established in virtue, gifted with virtue that had grown great.'

'He was intelligent, expert, and wise; foremost, or at most the second, among those who hold out the ladle.'

'Thus these four gifts of his, too became wherewithal to furnish forth that sacrifice.'

15. 'And further, O Brahman, the chaplain, before the sacrifice had begun, explained to King Wide-realm the three modes:

‘Should his majesty the King, before starting on the great sacrifice, feel any such regret as : “Great, alas, will be the portion of my wealth used up herein,” let not the king harbour such regret. Should his majesty the King, whilst he is offering the great sacrifice, feel any such regret as : “Great, alas, will be the portion of my wealth used up herein” let not the king harbour such regret. Should his majesty the King, when the great sacrifice has been offered, feel any such regret as “Great, alas, will be the portion of my wealth used up herein,” let not the king harbour such regret.’

‘Thus did the chaplain, O Brahman, before the sacrifice, had begun, explained to King Wide-realm the three modes.’

16. ‘And further, O Brahman, the chaplain, before the sacrifice had begun, in order to prevent any compunction that might afterwards in ten ways, arise as regards those who had taken part therein, said : “Now there will come to your sacrifice, Sire, men who destroy the life of living things, and men who refrain therefrom, men who take what has not been given, and men who refrain therefrom, men who speak lies, and men who do not—men who slander and men who do not—men who speak rudely and men who do not—men who chatter vain things and men who refrain therefrom—men who covet and men who covet not—men who harbour illwill and men who harbour it not—men whose views are wrong and men whose views are right. Of each of these let them, who do evil, alone with their evil. For them who do well let your majesty offer, for them, Sire, arrange the rites, for them let the king gratify, in them shall our heart within find peace.”

17. ‘And further, O Brahman, the chaplain, whilst the king was carrying out the sacrifice, instructed and aroused and incited and gladdened his heart in sixteen ways : “Should there be people who should say of the king, as he is offering the sacrifice : ‘King Wide-realm is celebrating sacrifice without having invited the four classes of his subjects, without himself having the eight personal gifts, without the assistance of a Brahman who has the four personal gifts.’ Then would they speak not according to the fact. For the consent of the four classes has been obtained, the king had the eight, and his Brahman has the four, personal gifts. With regard to each and every one of these sixteen conditions the king may rest assured that it has been fulfilled. He can sacrifice, and be glad, and possess his heart in peace.”

18. ‘And further, O Brahman, at that sacrifice neither were any oxen slain, neither goats, nor fowls, nor fatted pigs, nor were any kinds of living creatures put to death. No trees were cut down to be used as posts, no Dabha grasses mown to strew around the sacrificial spot. And the slaves and messengers and workmen there employed were

driven neither by rods nor fear, nor carried on their work weeping with tears upon their faces. Whoso chose to help, he worked; whoso chose not to help, worked not. What each chose to do he did; what they chose not to do, that was left undone. With ghee and oil, and butter and milk, and honey and sugar only was that sacrifice accomplished.

19. 'And further, O Brahman, the Kshatriya vassals, and the ministers and officials, and the Brahmans of position, and the householders of substance, whether of the country or of the towns, went to King Wide-realm, taking with them much wealth, and said, "This abundant wealth, Sire, have we brought hither for the king's use. Let his majesty accept it at our hands!"

"Sufficient wealth have I, my friends, laid up, the produce of taxation that is just. Do you keep yours, and take away more with you!"

When they had thus been refused by the king, they went aside, and considered thus one with the other: "It would not beseem us now, were we to take this wealth away again to our own homes. King Wide-realm is offering a great sacrifice. Let us too make an after-sacrifice!"

20. 'So the Kshatriyas established a continual largesses to the east of the king's sacrificial pit, and the officials to the south thereof, and the Brahmans to the west thereof, and the householders to the north thereof. And the things given, and the manner of their gift, was in all respects like unto the great sacrifice of King Wide-realm himself.'

'Thus, O Brahman, there was a fourfold co-operation, and King Wide-realm was gifted with eight personal gifts, and his officiating Brahman with four. And there were three modes of the giving of that sacrifice. This, O Brahman, is what is called the due celebration of a sacrifice in its threefold mode and with its furniture of sixteen kinds.

21. 'And when he had thus spoken, those Brahmans lifted up their voices in tumult, and said: "How glorious the sacrifice, how pure its accomplishment!" But Kutadanta the Brahman sat there in silence.

Then those Brahmans said to Kutadanta: 'Why do you not approve the good words of the Samana Gotama as well-said?'

'I do not fail to approve; for he who approves not as well-said that which has been well spoken by the Samana Gotama, verily his head would split in twain. But I was considering that the Samana Gotama does not say: "Thus have I heard," nor "Thus behoves it to be," but says only, "Thus it was then," or "It was like that then". So I thought; "For a certainty the Samana Gotama himself must at that time have been King Wide-realm, or the Brahman who officiated for him at that sacrifice. Does the Venerable Gotama admit that he who celebrates such a sacrifice, or causes it to be celebrated, is reborn at the

dissolution of the body, after death, into some state of happiness in heaven?"

'Yes, O Brahman, that I admit. And at that time I was the Brahman who, as chaplain, had that sacrifice performed.'

22. 'Is there, O Gotama, any other sacrifice less difficult and less troublesome, with more fruit and more advantage still than this?'

'Yes, O Brahman, there is.'

'And what, O Gotama, may that be?'

'The perpetual gifts kept up in a family where they are given specifically to virtuous recluses.'

23. 'But what is the reason, O Gotama, and what the cause, why such perpetual giving specifically to virtuous recluses, and kept up in a family, are less difficult and troublesome of greater fruit and greater advantage than that other sacrifice with its three modes and its accessories of sixteen kinds?'

'To the latter sort of sacrifice, O Brahman, neither will the Arhata go, nor such as have entered on the Arhat way. And why not? Because in it beating with sticks takes place, and seizing by the throat. But they will go to the former, where such things are not. And therefore are such perpetual gifts above the other sort of sacrifice.'

24. 'And is there, O Gotama, any other sacrifice less difficult and less troublesome, of greater fruit and of greater advantage than either of these.'

'Yes, O Brahman, there is.'

'And what, O Gotama, may that be?'

'The putting up of a dwelling place (Vihara) on behalf of the Order in all the four directions.'

25. 'And is there, O Gotama, any other sacrifice less difficult and less troublesome, of greater fruit and of greater advantage than each and all of these three?'

'Yes, O Brahman, there is.'

'And what, O Gotama, may that be?'

'He who with trusting heart takes a Buddha as his guide, and the Truth, and the Order—that is a sacrifice better than open largesses, better than perpetual alms, better than the gift of a dwelling place.'

26. 'And is there, O Gotama, any other sacrifice less difficult and less troublesome, of greater fruit and of greater advantage than all these four?'

'When a man with trusting heart takes upon himself the precepts—abstinence from destroying life; abstinence from taking what has not been given; abstinence from evil conduct in respect of lusts; abstinence from lying words; abstinence from strong, intoxicating, maddening

drinks, the root of carelessness, that is a sacrifice better than open largesses, better than perpetual alms, better than the gift of dwelling places, better than accepting guidance.'

27. 'And is there, O Gotama, any other sacrifice less difficult and less troublesome, of greater fruit and of greater advantage than all these five?'

'Yes, O Brahman, there is.'

'And what, O Gotama, may that be?'

(The answer is the long passage from the Samana-phale Sutta 40, p. 62 (of the text,) down to 75 (p. 74) on the First Ghana, as follows:

1. The Introductory paragraphs on the appearance of a Buddha, his preaching, the conversion of a hearer, and his renunciation of the world.

2. The Silas (minor morality).

3. The paragraph on Confidence.

4. The paragraph on 'Guarded is the door of his senses.'

5. The paragraph on 'Mindful and self possessed.'

6. The paragraph on Content.

7. The paragraph on Solitude.

8. The paragraph on the Five Hindrances.

9. The description of the First Ghana.)

'This, O Brahman, is a sacrifice less difficult and less troublesome, of greater fruit and greater advantage than the previous sacrifices,

(The same is then said the Second, Third, and Fourth Ghanas, in succession (as in the Samannao-phalo Sutas 77-82) and of the Insight arising from knowledge (*ibid* 83, 84), and further (omitting direct mention either way of 85-96 inclusive) of the knowledge of the destruction of the Asavas, the deadly intoxications or floods (*ibid*. 97-98).

'And there is no sacrifice man can celebrate, O Brahman, higher and sweeter than this.'

28. And when he had thus spoken, Kutadanta the Brahman said to the Blessed One:

'Most excellent, O Gotama, are the words of thy mouth, most excellent! Just as if a man were to set up what has been thrown down, or were to reveal that which has been hidden away, or were to point out the right road to him who has gone astray, or were to bring a light into the darkness so that those who had eyes could see external forms—just even so has the truth been made known to me in many a figure by the Venerable Gotama. I, even I, betake myself to the Venerable Gotama as my guide, to the Doctrine and the Order. May the Venerable One accept me as a disciple, as one who, from this day

forth, as long as life endures has taken him as his guide. And I myself, O Gotama, will have the seven hundred bulls, and the seven hundred steers, and the seven hundred heifers, and the seven hundred goats, and the seven hundred rams set free. To them I grant their life. Let them eat green grass and drink fresh water, and may cool breezes waft around them.'

29. Then the Blessed One discoursed to Kutadanta the Brahman in due order; that is to say, he spake to him of generosity, of right conduct, of heaven, of the danger, the vanity, and the defilement of lusts, of the advantages of renunciation. And when the Blessed One became aware that Kutadanta the Brahman had become prepared, softened, unprejudiced, upraised, and believing in heart then did he proclaim the doctrine the Buddhas alone have won; that is to say, the doctrine of sorrow, of its origin, of its cessation and of the Path. And just as a clean cloth, with all stains in it washed away, will readily take the dye, just even so did Kutadanta the Brahman, even while seated there, obtain the pure and spotless Eye for the Truth. And he knew whatsoever has a beginning, in that is inherent also the necessity of dissolution.

30. And then the Brahman Kutadanta, as one who had seen the Truth, had mastered it, understood it, dived deep down into it. Who had passed beyond doubt, and put away perplexity and gained full confidence, who had become dependent on no other for his knowledge of the teaching of the Master, addressed the Blessed One and said:

'May the venerable Gotama grant me the favour of taking his tomorrow meal with me, and also the members of the Order with him.'

And the Blessed One signified, by silence, his consent. Then the Brahman Kutadanta, seeing that the Blessed One had accepted, rose from his seat, and keeping his right towards him as he passed, he departed thence. And at daybreak he had sweet food, both hard and soft, made ready at the pit prepared for his sacrifice and had the time announced to the Blessed One: 'It is time, O Gotama and the meal is ready.' And the Blessed One, who had dressed early in the morning, put on his outer robe, and taking his bowl with him, went with the brethren to Kutadanta's sacrificial pit, and sat down there on the seat prepared for him. And Kutadanta the Brahman satisfied the brethren with the Buddha at their head, with his own hand, with sweet food, both hard and soft, till they refused any more. And when the Blessed One had finished his meal, and cleansed the bowl and his hands, Kutadanta the Brahman took a low seat and seated himself beside him. And when he was thus seated, the Blessed One instructed and aroused

and incited and gladdened Kutadanta the Brahman with religious discourse; and then arose from his seat and departed thence.

## KUTADANTA SUTTA IS ENDED

### V

Thirdly Buddha denounced the caste system. The Caste System in its present form was not then existing. The bar against inter-dining and inter-marriage had not then become operative. Things were flexible and not rigid as they are now. But the principle of inequality which is the basis of the caste system had become well established and it was against this principle that Buddha carried on a determined and a bitter fight. How strongly was he opposed to the pretensions of the Brahmins for superiority over the other classes and how convincing were the grounds of his opposition are to be found in many of his dialogues. The most important one of these is known as the Ambattha Sutta.

## AMBATTHA SUTTA

(A young Brahman's rudeness and an old one's faith).

1. Thus have I heard. The Blessed One when once on a tour through the Kosala country with a great company of the brethren, with about five hundred brethren, arrived at a Brahman village in Kosala named Ikkhanankala; and while there he stayed in the Ikkhanankala Wood.

Now at that time the Brahman Pokkharsadi was dwelling at Ukkattha, a spot teeming with life, with much grassland and woodland and corn, on a royal domain, granted him by King Pasenadi of Kosala as royal gift, with power over it as if he were the king.

2. Now the Brahman Pokkharasadi heard the news: 'They say that the Samana Gotama, of the Sakya clan, who went out from a Sakya family to adopt the religious life, has now arrived, with a great company of the brethren of his Order, at Ikkhanankala, and is staying there in the Ikkhanankala Wood. Now regarding that venerable Gotama, such is the high reputation that has been noised abroad: The Blessed One is an Arahāt, a fully awakened one, abounding in wisdom and goodness, happy, with knowledge of the worlds, unsurpassed as a guide to mortals willing to be led, a teacher for gods and men, a Blessed One, a Buddha. He, by himself, thoroughly knows and sees, as it were, face to face this universe, including the worlds above of the gods, the Brahmins, and the Maras, and the world below with its recluses and Brahmins, its princes and peoples, and having known it,



he makes his knowledge known to others. The truth, lovely in its origin, lovely in its progress, lovely in its consummation, doth he proclaim, both in the spirit and in the letter, the higher life doth he make known, in all its fullness and in all its purity.

‘And good is it to pay visits to Arahats like that.’

3. Now at the time a young Brahman, an Ambattha, was a pupil under Pokkharasadi the Brahman. And he was a repeater (of the sacred words) knowing the mystic verses by heart, one who had mastered the Three Vedas, with the indices, the ritual, the phonology, and the exegesis (as a fourth), and the legends as a fifth learned in the idioms and the grammar, versed in Lokayata sophistry and in the theory of the signs on the body of a great man—so recognised an authority in the system of the threefold Vedic knowledge as expounded by his master, that he could say of him: ‘What I know that you know, and what you know that I know.’

4. And Pokkharasadi told Ambattha the news, and said: ‘Come now, dear Ambattha, go to the Samana Gotama, and find out whether the reputation so noised abroad regarding him is in accord with the facts or not, whether the Samana Gotama is such as they say or not’.

5. ‘But how, Sir, shall I know whether that is so or not?’

‘There have been handed down, Ambattha, in our mystic verses thirty-two bodily signs of a great man,—signs which, if a man has, he will become one of two things, and no other. If he dwells at home he will become a sovereign of the world, a righteous king, bearing rule even to the shores of the four great oceans, a conqueror, the protector of his people, possessor of the seven royal treasures. And these are the seven treasures that he has the Wheel, the Elephant, the Horse, the Gem, the Woman, the Treasurer, and the Adviser as a seventh. And he has more than a thousand sons, heroes, mighty in frame, beating down the armies of the foe. And he dwells in complete ascendancy over the wide earth from sea to sea, ruling it in righteousness without the need of baton or of sword. But if he go forth from the household life into the houseless state, then he will become a Buddha who removes the veil from the eyes of the world. Now I, Ambattha, am a giver of the mystic verses; you have received them from me.’

6. ‘Very good Sir, said Ambattha in reply; and rising from his seat and paying reverence to Pokkharasadi, he mounted a chariot drawn by mares, and proceeded, with a retinue of young Brahmans, to the Ikkhanankala Wood. And when he had gone on in the chariot as far as the road was practicable for vehicles, he got down, and went on, into the park, on foot.

7. Now at that time a number of the brethren were walking up and down in the open air. And Ambattha went up to them, and said: 'Where may the Venerable Gotama be lodging now? We have come hither to call upon him.'

8. Then the brethren thought: 'This young Brahman Ambattha is of distinguished family, and a pupil of the distinguished Brahman Pokkharasadi. The Blessed One will not find it difficult to hold conversation with such.' And they said to Ambattha: 'There Gotama is lodging, where the door is shut, go quietly up and enter the porch gently, and give a cough, and knock on the crossbar. The Blessed One will open the door for you.'

9. Then Ambattha did so. And the Blessed One opened the door, and Ambattha entered in. And the other young Brahmins also went in; and they exchanged with the Blessed One the greetings and compliments of politeness and courtesy, and took their seats. But Ambattha, walking about, said something or other of a civil kind in an off-hand way, fidgetting about the while, or standing up, to the Blessed One sitting there.

10. And the Blessed One said to him; 'Is that the way, Ambattha, that you would hold converse with aged teachers, and teachers of your teachers well stricken in years, as you now do, moving about the while or standing, with me thus seated?'

11. 'Certainly not, Gotama. It is proper to speak, with a Brahman as one goes along only when the Brahman himself is walking and standing to a Brahman who stands, and seated to a Brahman who has taken his seat, or reclining to a Brahman who reclines. But with shavelings, sham friars, menial black fellows, the offscouring of our kinsman's heels—with them I would talk as I now do to you.'

'But you must have been wanting something, Ambattha, when you come here. Turn your thoughts rather to the object you had in view when you came. This young Brahman Ambattha is ill bred, though he prides himself on his culture; what can this come from except from want of training?'

12. Then Ambattha was displeased and angry with the Blessed One at being called rude; and at the thought that the Blessed One was vexed with him, he said, scoffing, jeering, and sneering at the Blessed One: 'Rough is this Sakya breed of yours, Gotama, and rude, touchy is this Sakya breed of yours and violent. Menials, mere menials, they neither venerate, nor value, nor esteem, nor give gifts to, nor pay honour to Brahmins. That, Gotama, is neither fitting, nor is it seemly.'

Thus did the young Brahman Ambattha for the first time charge the Sakyas with being menials.

13. 'But in what then, Ambattha, have the Sakyas given you offence?'

'Once, Gotama, I had to go to Kapilvastu on some business or other of Pokkharasadi's, and went into the Sakyas' Congress Hall. Now at that time there were a number of Sakyas, old and young, seated in the hall on grand seats, making merry and joking together, nudging one another with their fingers; and for a truth, methinks, it was I myself that was the subject of their jokes; and not one of them even offered me a seat. That, Gotama, is neither fitting, nor is it seemly, that the Sakyas, menials, as they are, mere menials, should neither venerate, nor value, nor esteem, nor give gifts to, nor pay honour to Brahmans.'

Thus did the young Brahman Ambattha for the second time charge the Sakyas with being menials.

14. 'Why a quail Ambattha, little hen bird tough she be, can say what she likes in her own nest. And there the Sakyas are at their own home, in Kapilvastu. It is not fitting for you to take offence at so trifling a thing.'

15. 'There are these four grades, Gotama,—the nobles, the Brahmans, the tradesfolk, and the work-people. And of these four, three—the nobles, the tradesfolk, and work-people—are, verily, but attendants on the Brahmans. So, Gotama, that is neither fitting nor is it seemly, that the Sakyas, menials as they are, mere menials should neither venerate, nor value, nor esteem, nor give gifts to, nor pay honour to the Brahmans.'

\* Thus did the young Brahman Ambattha for the third time charged the sakyas with being menials.

16. Then the Blessed One thought thus: 'This Ambattha is very set on humbling the Sakyas with his charge of servile origin. What if I were to ask him as to his own lineage.' And he said to him:

'And what family do you then, Ambattha, belong to?'

'Yes, but if one were to follow up your ancient name and lineage, Ambattha, on the father's and the mother's side, it would appear that the Sakyas were once your masters, and that you are the offspring of one of their slave girls. But the Sakyas trace their line back to Okkaka the kings.'

'Long ago, Ambattha, King Okkaka, wanting to divert the succession in favour of the son of his favourite queen, banished his elder children—Okkamukha, Karanda, Hatthinika, and Sinipura—from the land. And being thus banished they took up their dwelling on the slopes of the Himalaya, on the borders of a lake where a mighty oak tree grew. And through fear of injuring the purity of their line they intermarried with their sisters.

'Now Okkaka the king asked the ministers at his court: "Where, Sirs, are the children now?"

'There is a spot, Sire, on the slopes of the Himalaya, on the borders of a lake, where there grows a mighty oak (sako). There do they dwell. And lest they should injure the purity of their line they have married their own (sakahi) sisters.'

'Then did Okkaka the king burst forth in admiration: "Hearts of oak (sakya) are those young fellows! Right well they hold their own (parama sakya)!"

'That is the reason, Ambattha, why they are known as Sakyas. Now Okkaka had slave girl called Disa. She gave birth to a black baby. And no sooner was it born than the little black thing said, "Wash me, mother. Bathe me, mother. Set me free, mother of this dirt. So shall I be of use to you."

Now, just as now, Ambattha, people call devils, "devils", so then they called devils. "black fellows" (kanhe). And they said, "This fellow spoke as soon as he was born.' Tis a black thing (Kanha) that is born, a devil has been born!" And that is the origin, Ambattha, of the Kanhayanas. He was the ancestor of the Kanhayanas. And thus is it, Ambattha, that if one were to follow up your ancient name and lineae, on the father's and on the mother's side, it would appear that the Sakyas were once your masters, and that you are the offspring of one of their slave girls.'

17. When he had thus spoken the young Brahmans said to the Blessed One: 'Let not the Venerable Gotama, humble Ambattha too sternly with this reproach of being descended from a slave girl. He is well born, Gotama, and of good family; he is versed in the sacred hymns, an able reciter, a learned man. And he is able to give answer to the Venerable Gotama in these matters.

18. Then the Blessed One said to them: 'Quite so. If you thought otherwise, then it would be for you to carry on our discussion further. But as you think so, let Ambattha himself speak.'

19. 'We do not think so; and we will hold our peace. Ambattha is able to give answer to the venerable Gotama in these matters.'

20. Then the Blessed One said to Ambattha the Brahman: 'Then this further question arises, Ambattha, a very reasonable one which even though unwillingly, you should answer. If you do not give a clear reply, or go off upon another issue, or remain silent, or go away, then your head will split in pieces on the spot. What have you heard, when Brahmans old and well stricken in years, teachers of yours or their teachers, were talking together, as to whence the Kanhayanas draw their origin, and who the ancestor was to whom they trace themselves back?'

And when he had thus spoken Ambattha remained silent. And the Blessed One asked the same question again. And still Ambattha remained silent. Then the Blessed One said to him: 'You had better answer, now, Ambattha. This is no time for you to hold your peace. For whosoever, Ambattha, does not, even up to the third time of asking, answer a reasonable question put by a Tathagata (by one who has won the truth), his head splits into pieces on the spot.'

21. Now at that time the spirit who bears the thunderbolt stood over above Ambattha in the sky with a mighty mass of iron, all fiery, dazzling, and aglow, with the intention, if he did not answer, there and then to split his head in pieces. And the Blessed One perceived the spirit bearing the thunderbolt, and so did Ambattha the Brahman. And Ambattha on becoming aware of it, terrified, startled, and agitated, seeking safety and protection and help from the Blessed One, crouched down besides him in awe, and said: 'What was it the Blessed One said? Say it once again!'

'What do you think, Ambattha? What have you heard, when Brahmans old and well stricken in years, teachers of yours or their teachers, were talking together, as to whence the Kanhayanas draw their origin, and who the ancestor was to whom they trace themselves back?'

'Just so, Gotama, did I hear, even as the Venerable Gotama hath said. That is the origin of the Kanhayana, and that the ancestor to whom they trace themselves back.'

22. And when he had thus spoken the young Brahmans fell into tumult, and uproar, and turmoil; and said: 'Low born, they say, is Ambattha the Brahman; his family, they say, is not of good standing; they say he is descended from a slave girl; and the Sakyas were his masters. We did not suppose that the Samana Gotama, whose words are righteousness itself, was not a man to be trusted!'

23. And the Blessed One thought: 'They go too far, these Brahmans, in their depreciation of Ambattha as the offspring of a slave girl. Let me set him free from their reproach.' And he said to them: 'Be not too severe in disparaging Ambattha the Brahman on the ground of his descent. That Kanha became a mighty seer. He went into the Dekkan, there he learnt mystic verses, and returning to Okkaka the king, he demanded his daughter Madda-rupi in marriage. To him the king in answer said: "Who forsooth is this fellow, who—son of my slave girl as he is—asks for my daughter in marriage;" and, angry and displeased, he fitted an arrow to his bow. But neither could he let the arrow fly, nor could he take it off the string again.'

Then the ministers and courtiers went to Kanha the seer, and said: "Let the king go safe, Sir, let the king go safe."

"The king shall suffer no harm. But should he shoot the arrow downwards, then would the earth dry up as far as his realm extends."

"Let the king, Sir, go safe, and the country too."

"The king shall suffer no harm, nor his land. But should he shoot the arrow upwards, the god would not rain for seven years as far as his realm extends."

"Let the king, Sir, go safe, and the country too."

"The king shall suffer no harm, nor his land. But should he shoot the arrow upwards, the god would not rain for seven years as far as his realm extends."

"Let the king, Sir, go safe, and the country too; and let the god rain."

"The king shall suffer no harm, nor the land either, and the god shall rain. But let the king aim the arrow at his eldest son. The prince shall suffer no harm, not a hair of him shall be touched."

'Then, O Brahmins, the ministers told this to Okkaka, and said: "Let the king aim at his eldest son. He will suffer neither harm nor terror." And the king did so, and no harm was done. But the king, terrified at the lesson given him, gave the man his daughter Maddarupi as wife. You should not, O Brahmins, be too severe to disparage Ambattha in the matter of his slave-girl ancestry. That Kanha was a mighty seer.'

24. Then the Blessed One said to Ambattha; 'What think you, Ambattha? Suppose a young Kshatriya should have connection with a Brahman maiden, and from their intercourse a son should be born. Now would the son thus come to the Brahman maiden through the Kshatriya youth receive a seat and water (as token of respect) from the Brahmins?

'Yes, he would, Gotama.'

'But would the Brahmins allow him to partake of the feast offered to the dead, or of the food boiled in milk, or of the offerings to the gods, or of food sent as a present?'

'Yes, they would Gotama.'

'But would the Brahmins teach him their verses or not?'

'They would, Gotama.'

'But would he be shut off, or not, from their women?'

'He would not be shut off.'

'But would the Kshatriyas allow him to receive the consecration ceremony of a Kshatriya?'

'Certainly not, Gotama.'

‘Because he is not of pure descent on the mother’s side.’

25. ‘Then what think you Ambattha? Suppose a Brahman youth should have connection with a Kshatriya maiden, and from their intercourse a son should be born. Now would the son come to the Kshatriya maiden through the Brahman youth receive a seat and water (as token of respect) from the Brahmins?’

‘Yes, he would, Gotama.’

‘But would the Brahmins allow him to partake of the feast offered to the dead, or of food boiled in milk, or of an offering to the gods, or of food sent as a present?’

‘Yes, they would, Gotama.’

‘But would the Brahmins teach him their verses or not?’

‘They would, Gotama.’

‘But would the Kshatriyas allow him to receive the consecration ceremony of a Kshatriya.’

‘Certainly not, Gotama.’

‘Why not that?’

‘Because he is not of pure descent on the father’s side.’

26. ‘Then, Ambattha, whether one compares women with women, or men with men, the Kshatriyas are higher and the Brahmins inferior.

‘And what think you, Ambattha? Suppose the Brahmins, for some offence or other, were to outlaw a Brahman by shaving him and pouring ashes over his head, were to banish him from the land from the township. Would he be offered a seat or water among the Brahmins?’

‘Certainly not, Gotama.’

‘Or would the Brahmins allow him to partake of the food offered to the dead, or of the food boiled in milk, or of the offerings to the gods, or of food sent as a present?’

‘Certainly not, Gotama.’

‘Or would the Brahmins teach him their verses or not?’

‘Certainly not, Gotama.’

‘And would he be shut off, or not, from their women?’

‘He would be shut off.’

27. ‘But what think you, Ambattha? If the Kshatriyas had in the same way outlawed a Kshatriya and banished him from the land or the township, would he, among the Brahmins, be offered water and a seat?’

‘Yes, he would, Gotama.’

‘And would he be allowed to partake of the food offered to the dead, or of the food boiled in milk, or of the offerings to the gods, or of food sent as a present?’

‘He would, Gotama.’

‘And would the Brahmans teach him their verses?’

‘They would, Gotama?’

‘And would he be shut off, or not, from their women?’

‘He would not, Gotama.’

‘But thereby, Ambattha, the Kshatriya would have fallen into the deepest degradation, shaven as to his head, cut dead with the ash-basket, banished from land and townships. So that, even when a Kshatriya has fallen into the deepest degradation, still it holds good that the Kshatriyas are higher, and the Brahmans inferior.

28. ‘Moreover it was one of the Brahma gods, Sanam-kumara, who uttered this stanza.’

“The Kshatriya is the best of those among this folk who put their trust in lineage.

But he who is perfect in wisdom and righteousness, he is the best among gods and men.”

‘Now this stanza, Ambattha, was well sung and not ill sung by the Brahma Sanam-kumara, well said and not ill said, full of meaning and not void thereof. And I too approve it,

‘I also’ Ambattha says:

“The Kshatriya is the best of those among this folk who put their trust in lineage,

But he who is perfect in wisdom and righteousness, he is the best among gods and men.”

## HERE ENDS THE FIRST PORTION FOR RECITATION

.....

1. ‘But what, Gotama, is the righteousness and what the wisdom spoken of in that verse?’

‘In the supreme perfection in wisdom and righteousness, Ambattha, there is no reference to the question either of birth, or of lineage, or of the pride which says: “You are held as worthy as I”, or “You are not held as worthy as I”. It is where the talk is of marrying, or giving in marriage, that reference is made to such things as that. For whosoever, Ambattha, are in bondage to the notions of birth or of lineage, or to the pride of social position, or of connection by marriage, they are far from the best wisdom and righteousness. It is only by having got rid of all such bondage that one can realise for himself that supreme perfection in wisdom and in conduct.

2. ‘But what, Gotama, is that conduct, and what that wisdom?’  
[Here follow, under ‘Morality’ (Sila)]

The introductory paragraphs (40-42 of the ‘Samanaphala’ pp. 62, 63 of the text) on the appearance of a Buddha, his preaching the conversion of a hearer, and his renunciation of the world: then come,



1. The Silas above pp. 4-12 (8-27) of the text. Only the refrain differs. It runs here, at the end of each clause, through the whole of this repeated passage: 'This is reckoned in him as morality.'

Then under 'Conduct' (Karuna).

2. The paragraph on 'Confidence,' above, p. 69 of the text 63. The refrain from here onwards is: This is reckoned to him as conduct.

3. The paragraph on 'Guarded is the door of the senses' above. p. 70 of the text, 64.

4. The paragraph on 'Mindful and self-possessed,' above, p. 70 of the text 65.

5. The paragraph on 'Content,' above. p. 71 of the text, 66.

6. The paragraph on 'Solitude,' above, p. 71 of the text, 67.

7. The paragraphs on the 'Five Hindrances,' above pp, 71-2 of the text, 68-74.

8. The paragraphs on the 'Four Rapt Contemplations' above, 73-76, pp. 75-82. The refrain at the end of each of them ('higher and better than the last') is here of course, to be read not as higher fruit of the life of a recluse, but as higher conduct.

#### UNDER WISDOM (VIGGA)

9. The Paragraphs on 'Insight arising from Knowledge' (Nana-dassanam), above, p. 76 of the text, 83, 84. The refrain from here onwards is: 'This is reckoned in him as wisdom, and it is higher and sweeter than the last.'

10. The paragraphs on the 'Mental Image,' above, p. 77 of the text 85, 86.

11. The paragraphs on 'Mystic Gifts' (Iddhi), above, p. 77 of the text, 87, 88.

12. The paragraphs on the 'Heavenly Ear' (Dibbasota), above p. 79 of the text, 89, 90.

13. The paragraphs on 'Knowledge of the hearts of others' (Kato-pariya-nanam) above p. 79 of the text 91, 92.

14. The paragraphs on 'Memory of one's own previous births' (Pubbe-nivasa-anussati-nama) above, p. 81 of the text, 93, 94.

15. The paragraph on the 'Divine Eye' (Dibbakakkhu), above, p. 82 of the text, 95, 96.

16. The paragraphs on the 'Destruction of the Deadly Floods' (Asavanam Khaya-nanam), above, p. 83 of the text. 97, 98.

'Such a man, Ambattha, is said to be perfect in wisdom, perfect in conduct, perfect in wisdom and conduct. And there is no other perfection in wisdom and conduct higher and sweeter than this.'

3. 'Now, Ambattha, to this supreme perfection in wisdom and goodness there are Four Leakages. And what are the four?'

'In case, Ambattha, any recluse or Brahman, without having thoroughly attained unto this supreme perfection in wisdom and conduct, with his yoke on his shoulder (to carry fire-sticks, a water-pot, needles, and the rest of a mendicant friar's outfit), should plunge into the depths of the forest, vowing to himself: "I will henceforth be one of those who live only on fruits that have fallen of themselves"—then, verily, he turns that out worthy only to be a servant unto him that hath attained to wisdom and rightsouness.'

'And again, Ambattha, in case any recluse or Brahman, without having thoroughly attained unto this supreme perfection in wisdom and conduct, and without having attained to living only on fruits fallen of themselves, taking a hoe and a basket with him, should plunge into the depths of the forest, vowing to himself: "I will henceforth be one of those who live only on bulbs and roots of fruits." Then, verily he turns out worthy only to be a servant unto him who hath attained to wisdom and righteousness.'

'And again, Ambattha, in case any recluse or Brahman, without having thoroughly attained unto this supreme perfection in wisdom and conduct, and without having attained to living only on fruits fallen of themselves, and without having attained to living only on bulbs and roots and fruits, should build himself a fires-hrine near the boundries of some village or some town, and there dwell serving the fire-god,—then, verily he turns out worthy only to be a servant unto him that hath attained to wisdom and righteousness.'

'And again, Ambattha, in case any recluse or Brahman, without having thoroughly attained unto this supreme perfection in wisdom and conduct, and without having attained to living only on fruits fallen of themselves, and without having attained to living only on bulbs and roots and fruits, and without having attained to serving the fire-god, should build himself a four-doored almshouse at a crossing where four high roads meet, and dwell there, saying to himself: "Whosoever, whether recluse or Brahman, shall pass here, from either of these four directions, him will I entertain according to my ability and according to my power—then, verily, he turns out worthy only to be a servant unto him who hath attained to wisdom and righteousness.'

'These are the Four Leakages, Ambattha, to supreme perfection in righteousness and conduct.'

4. 'Now what think you, Ambattha? Have you, as one of a class of pupils under the same teacher, been instructed in this supreme perfection of wisdom and conduct?'

'Not that, Gotama. How little is it that I can profess to have learnt ! How supreme this perfection of wisdom and conduct ! Far is it from me to have been trained therein ?'

'Then what think you, Ambattha ? Although you have not thoroughly attained unto this supreme perfection of wisdom and goodness, have you been trained to take the yoke upon your shoulders, and plunge into the depths of the forest as one who would fain observe the vow of living only on fruits fallen of themselves ?'

'Not even that, Gotama.'

'Then what think you Ambattha ? Although you have not attained unto this supreme perfection of wisdom and goodness, nor have attained to living on fruits fallen of themselves, have you been trained to take hoe and basket, and plunge into the depths of the forest as one who would fain observe the vow of living only on bulbs and roots and fruits ?'

'Not even that, Gotama.'

'Then what think you, Ambattha ? Although you have not attained unto this supreme perfection of wisdom and goodness, and have not attained to living on fruits fallen of themselves, and have not attained to living on bulbs and roots and fruits, have you been taught to build yourself a fire-shrine on the borders of some village or some town, and dwell there as one who would fain serve the fire-god ?'

'Not even that, Gotama.'

'Then what think you, Ambattha ? Although you have not attained unto this supreme perfection of wisdom and goodness, and have not attained to living on fruits fallen of themselves, and have not attained to living on bulbs and roots and fruits, and have not attained to serving the firegod, have you been taught to build yourself a four-doored almshouse at a spot where four high roads cross, and dwell there as one who would fain observe the vow to entertain whosoever might pass that way, from any of the four directions, according to your ability and according to your power ?'

'Not even that, Gotama.'

5. 'So then you, Ambattha, as a pupil, have fallen short of due training, not only in the supreme wisdom and conduct, but even in any one of the Four Leakages by which the complete attainment thereof is debarred. And your teacher too, the Brahman Pokkharasadi, has told you this saying : " Who are these shavelings, sham friars, menial black fellows, the offscouring of our kinsman's heels, that they should claim converse with Brahmans versed in the threefold Vedic Lore ! "—he himself not having even fulfilled any one even of these lesser duties (which lead men to neglect the higher ones). See, Ambattha,

how deeply your teacher the Brahman Pokkharasadi has herein done you wrong.'

6. 'And the Brhman Pokkharasadi Ambattha, is in the enjoyment of a grant from Pasenadi, the king of Kosala. But the king does not allow him to come into his presence. When he consults with him he speaks to him only from behind a curtain. How is it, Ambattha, that the very King, from whom he accepts this pure and lawful maintenance, King Pasendadi of Kosala, does not admit him to his presence? See, Ambattha, how deeply your teacher the Brahman Pokkharasadi, has herein done you wrong.'

7. 'Now what think you, Ambattha? Suppose a king, either seated on the neck of his elephant or on the back of his horse, or standing on the footrug of his chariot, should discuss some resolution of state with his chiefs or princes, and suppose as he left the spot and stepped on one side, a workman (Sudra) or the slave of a workman should come up and, standing there, should discuss the matter, saying: "Thus and thus said Pasendadi the King." Although he should speak as the king might have spoken, or discuss as the king might have done, would he thereby be the king, or even as one of his officers?'

'Certainly not, Gotama.'

8. 'But just so, Ambattha, those ancient poets (Rishis) of the Brahmins, the authors of the verses, the utterers of the verses whose ancient form of words so chanted, uttered, or composed the Brahmins of to-day chant over again and rehearse, intoning or reciting exactly as has been intoned or recited—to wit, Atthaka, Vamaka, Vamadeva, Yamataggi, Angirasa, Bharadvaja, Vasettha, Vessamitta, Kassapa, and Bhagu—though you can say: 'I as a pupil know by heart their verses 'that you should on that account by a Rishi, or have attained to the state of a Rishi—such a condition of things has no existence!'

9. 'Now what think you, Ambattha? What have you heard when Brahmins, old and well stricken in years, teachers of yours of their teachers, were talking together—did those ancient Rishis, whose verses you so chant over and repeat, parade about well groomed, perfumed, trimmed as to their hair and beard adorned with garlands and gems, clad in white garments, in the full possession and enjoyment of the five pleasures of sense, as you, and your teacher too, do now?'

'Not that, Gotama.'

'Or did they live, as their food, on boiled rice of the best sorts, from which all the black specks had been sought out and removed, and flavoured with sauces and curries of various kind as you, and your teacher too, do now?'

'Not that, Gotama.'

‘Or were they waited upon by women with fringes and furbelows round their loins, as you, and your teacher too, do now?’

‘Or did they go about driving chariots, drawn by mares with plaited manes and tails, using long wands and goads the while, as you, and your teacher too, do now?’

‘Not that Gotama.’

‘Or did they have themselves guarded in fortified towns, with moats dug out round them and crossbars let down before the gates, by men girl with long swords, as you, and your teacher too, do now?’

‘Not that Gotama.’

10. ‘So then, Ambattha, neither are you a Rishi, nor your teacher, nor do you live under the conditions under which the Rishis lived. But whatsoever it may be, Ambattha, concerning which you are in doubt or perplexity about me, ask me as to that, I will make it clear by explanation.’

11. Then the Blessed One went forth from his chamber, and began to walk up and down that Ambattha did the same. And as he thus walked up and down, following the Blessed One, he took stock of the thirty-two signs of a great man, whether they appeared on the body of the Blessed One or not. And he perceived them all save only two. With respect to those two—the concealed member and the extent of tongue—he was in doubt and perplexity, not satisfied not sure.

12. And the Blessed One knew that he was so in doubt. And he so arranged matters by his Wondrous Gift that Ambattha the Brahman saw how that part of the Blessed One that ought to be hidden by clothes was enclosed in a sheath. And the Blessed One so bent round his tongue that he touched and stroked both his ears, touched and stroked both his nostrils, and the whole circumstance of his forehead he covered with his tongue.

And Ambattha, the young Brahman, thought: ‘The Samana Gotama is endowed with the thirty-two signs of a great man, with them all, not only with some of them.’ And he said to the Blessed One: ‘And now, Gotama, we would fain depart. We are busy and have much to do.’

‘Do Ambattha, what seemed to you fit.’

And Ambattha mounted his chariot drawn by mares, and departed thence.

13. Now at that time the Brahman Pokkharasadi had gone forth from Ukkattha with a great retinue of Brahmans, and was seated in his own pleasure waiting there for Ambattha. And Ambattha came on to the pleasure. And when he had come in his chariot as far as the path was practicable for chariots, he descended from it, and came on foot to where Pokkharasadi was, and saluted him, and took his seat

respectfully on one side. And when he was so seated, Pokkharasadi said to him.

14. 'Well, Ambattha! Did you see the Blessed One?'

'Yes, Sir, we saw him.'

'Well! is the Venerable Gotama so, as the reputation about him I told you of declares, and not otherwise. Is he such a one, or is he not?'

'He is so, Sir, as his reputation declares, and not otherwise. Such is he, not different. And he is endowed with the thirty-two signs of a great man, with all of them, not only with some.'

'And did you have any talk, Ambattha, with the Samana Gotama?'

'Yes, Sir, I had.'

'And how did the talk go?'

Then Ambattha told the Brahman Pokkharasadi all the talk that he had with the Blessed One.

15. When he had thus spoken, Pokkharasadi said to him: 'Oh, you wiseacre! Oh! you dullard! Oh! you expert, forsooth, in our threefold Vedic Lore! A man, they say, who should carry out his business thus, must, on the dissolution of the body, after death, be reborn into some dismal state of misery and woe. What could the very points you pressed in your insolent words lead up to, if not to the very disclosures the venerable Gotama made? What a wiseacre, what a dullard; what an expert, forsooth, in our threefold Vedic lore!' And angry and displeased, he struck out with his foot, and rolled Ambattha over. And he wanted, there and then, himself to go and call on the Blessed One.

1. But the Brahmanas there spake thus to Pokkharasadi: 'It is much too late, Sir, today to go to call on the Samana Gotama. The venerable Pokkharasadi can do so tomorrow.

So Pokkharasadi had sweet food, both hard and soft, made ready at his own house, and taken on wagons, by the light of blazing torches, out to Ukkattha. And he himself went on to the Ikkhanankala Wood, driving in his chariot as far as the road was practicable for vehicles, and then going on, on foot, to where the Blessed One was. And when he had exchanged with the Blessed One the greetings and compliments of politeness and courtesy, he took his seat on one side, and said to the Blessed One:

17. 'Has our pupil, Gotama, the young Brahman Ambattha, been here?'

'Yes, Brahman, he has.'

'And did you, Gotama, have any talk with him?'

'Yes, Brahman, I had.'

‘And on what wise was the talk that you had with him?’

18. Then the Blessed One told the Brahman Pokkharasadi all the talk that had taken place. And when he had thus spoken Pokkharasadi said to the Blessed One :

‘He is young and foolish, Gotama, that young Brahman Ambattha. Forgive him, Gotama.’

‘Let him be quite happy, Brahman, that young Brahman Ambattha.’

19. And the Brahman Pokkharasadi took stock, on the body of the Blessed One, of the thirty two marks of a Great Being. And he saw them all plainly, save only two. As to two of them the sheath concealed member and the extensive tongue—he was still in doubt and undecided. But the Blessed One showed them to Pokkharasadi, even as he had shown them to Ambattha. And Pokkharasadi perceived that the Blessed One was endowed with the thirty two marks of a Great Being, with all of them, not only with some. And he said to the Blessed One: ‘May the venerable Gotama grant me the favour of taking his tomorrow’s meal with me, and also the members of the Order with him.’ And the Blessed One accepted, by silence, his request.

20. Then the Brahman Pokkharasadi, seeing that the Blessed One had accepted, had (on the morrow) the time announced to him: ‘It is time, Oh Gotama, the meal is ready.’ And the Blessed One, who had dressed in the early morning, put on his outer robe, and taking his bowl with him, went, with the brethren to Pokkharasadi’s house, and sat down on the seat prepared for him. And Pokkharasadi the Brahman, satisfied the Blessed One, with his own hand, with sweet food, both hard and soft, until he refused any more, and the young Brahmans the members of the Order. And when the Blessed One had finished his meal, and cleansed the bowl and his hands, Pokkharasadi took a low seat, and sat down beside him.

21. Then to him thus seated the Blessed One discoursed in due order; that is to say, he spoke to him of generosity, of right conduct, of heaven, of the danger, the vanity, and the defilement of lusts, of the advantages of renunciation. And when the Blessed One saw that Pokkharasadi the Brahman, had become prepared, softened, unprejudiced, upraised, and believing in heart, then he proclaimed the doctrine the Buddhas alone have won; that is to say, the doctrine of sorrow, of its origin, of its cessation, and of the Path. And just as a clean cloth from which all stain has been washed away will readily take the dye, just even so did Pokkharasadi the Brahman, obtain, even while sitting there, the pure and spotless Eye for the Truth, and he knew: ‘Whatsoever has a beginning in that is inherent also the necessity of dissolution.’

22. And then the Brahman Pokkarasadi as one who had seen the Truth, had mastered it, understood it, dived deep down into it, who had passed beyond doubt and put away perplexity and gained full confidence, who had become dependent on no other man for his knowledge of the teaching of the Master, addressed the Blessed One and said:

‘Most excellent Oh Gotama (are the words of thy mouth), most excellent! Just as if a man were to set up that which has been thrown down, or were to reveal that which has been hidden away, or were to point out the right road to him who has gone astray, or were to bring a light into the darkness so that those who had eyes could see external forms,—just even so, Lord, has the truth been made known to me, in many a figure, by the venerable Gotama. And I, Oh Gotama, with my sons, and my wife, and my people, and my companions, betake myself to the venerable Gotama as my guide, to the truth, and to the Order. May the venerable Gotama accept me as a disciple, as one who, from this day forth, as long as life endures, has taken him as his guide. And just as the venerable Gotama visits the families of others, his disciples, at Ukkatha, so let him visit mine. Whosoever there may be there, of Brahmans or their wives, who shall pay reverence to the venerable Gotama, or stand up in his presence, or offer him a seat or water, or take delight in him, to him that will be for long, a cause of weal and bliss.’

‘It is well, Brahman, what you say.’  
Here ends the Ambattha Sutta.

## VI

In the matter of his opposition to Caste, Buddha practised what he preached. He did what the Aryan Society refused to do. In the Aryan Society the Shudra or low caste man could never become a Brahman. But Buddha not only preached against caste but admitted the Shudra and the low caste to the rank of a Bhikku who held the same rank in Buddhism as the Brahman did in Brahmanism. As Rhys Davis points out: (Quotation not given)

In the first place, as regards his own Order, over which alone he had complete control, he ignores completely and absolutely all advantages or disadvantages arising from birth, occupation, and social status, and sweeping away all barriers and disabilities arising from the arbitrary rules of mere ceremonial or social impurity.

One of the most distinguished members of his Order, the very one of them who was referred to as the chief authority after Gotama himself,



on the rules of the Order, was Upali, who had formerly been a barber, one of the despised occupations. So Sunita, one of the brethren whose verses are chosen for insertion in the Thera Gatha, was a Pukkusa, one of the low tribes. Sati, the propounder of a deadly heresy, was of the sons of the fisherfolk, afterwards a low caste, and even then an occupation, on account of its cruelty, particularly abhorred. Nanda was a cowherd. The two Panthakas were born out of wedlock, to a girl of good family through intercourse with a slave (so that by the rule laid down in Manu 31, they were actually outcasts). Kapa was the daughter of a deer-stalker, Punna and Punnika had been slave girls. Sumangalamata was daughter and wife to workers in rushes, and Subha was the daughter of a smith. More instances could doubtless be quoted and others will become known when more texts are published.

It does not show much historical insight to sneer at the numbers as small, and to suggest that the supposed enlightenment or liberality was mere pretence. The facts speak for themselves; and the percentage of low-born members of the Order was probably in fair proportion to the percentage of persons belonging to the despised jatis and sippas as compared with the rest of the population. Thus of the Theris mentioned in the Theri Gatha we know the social position of sixty, of whom five are mentioned above—that is,  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent of the whole number were base-born. It is most likely that this is just about the proportion which persons in similar social rank bore to the rest of the population.

Just as Buddha levelled up the position of the Shudras and the low caste men by admitting them to the highest rank namely that of Bhikkus, he also levelled up the position of women. In the Aryan Society women were placed on the same position as the Shudras and in all Aryan literature women and Shudras are spoken of together as persons belonging to the same status. Both of them were denied the right to take *Sanyas*, as *Sanyas* was the only way open to salvation. Women and Shudras were beyond salvation. Buddha broke this Aryan rule in the case of women as he did in the case of the Shudras. Just as a Shudra could become a Bhikku so a woman could become a nun. This was taking her to the highest status then conceivable in the eyes of the Aryan Society.

Another issue on which Buddha fought against the leaders of the Aryan Society was the issue of the Ethics of teachers and teaching. The leaders of the Aryan Society held the view that learning and education was the privilege of the Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas. The Shudras were not entitled to education. They insisted that it would be danger to social order if they taught women or any males not

twice-born. Buddha repudiated this Aryan doctrine. As pointed out by Rhys Davis on this question is "That everyone should be allowed to learn; that everyone, having certain abilities, should be allowed to teach; and that, if he does teach, he should teach all to all; keeping nothing back, shutting no one out." In this connection reference may be made to the dialogue between Buddha and the Brahman Lohikka and which is known as the Lohikka Sutta.

## LOHIKKA SUTTA

(Some points in the Ethics of Teaching)

1. Thus have I heard. The Exalted One, when once passing on a tour through the Kosala districts with a great multitude of the members of the Order, with about five hundred Bhikshus, arrived at Salavatika (village surrounded by a row of Sala trees). Now at that time Lohikka the Brahman was established at Salavatika, a spot teeming with life, with much grassland and woodland and corn, on a royal domain granted him by King Pasenadi of Kosala, as a royal gift, with power over it as if he were the king.

2. Now at that time Lohikka the Brahman was thinking of harbouring the following wicked view; 'Suppose that a Samana or a Brahmana have reached up to some good state (of mind), then he should tell no one else about it. For what can one man do for another? To tell others would be like the man who, having broken through an old bond, should entangle himself in a new one. Like that, I say, is this (desire to declare to others); it is a form of lust. For what can one man do for another?'

Now Lohikka the Brahman heard the news: 'They say that the Samana Gotama, of the sons of the Sakyas, who went out from the Sakya clan to adopt the religious life, has now arrived, with a great company of the brethren of his Order, on his tour through the Kosala districts, at Salavatika. Now regarding that venerable Gotama, such is the high reputation that has been noised abroad: that Exalted One is an Arhat, fully awakened, abounding in wisdom and goodness, happy, with knowledge of the worlds, unsurpassed as a guide to mortals willing to be led, a teacher for gods and men, an exalted one, a Buddha. He, by himself thoroughly knows, and sees as it were face to face, this universe—including the worlds above of the gods, the Brahmins and the Maras; and the world below with its Samanas and Brahmins, its princes and peoples—and having known it, he makes his knowledge known to others. The truth, lovely in its origin, lovely in its progress, lovely in consummation, doth he proclaim both in the spirit

and in the letter. The higher life doth he make known in all its fullness, and in all its purity. And good is it to pay visits to Arhats like that.'

4. Then Lohikka the Brahman said to Bhesika the barber, 'Come now, good Bhesika, go where the Samana Gotama is staying, and on your arrival, ask in my name as to whether his sickness and indisposition as abated, as to his health and vigour and condition of ease; and speak thus: "May the venerable Gotama, and with him the brethren of the order, accept the tomorrow's meal from Lohikka the Brahman."

5. 'Very well, Sir,' said Bhesika the barber, acquiescing in the word of Lohikka the Brahman, and did so even as he had been enjoined. And the Exalted One consented, by silence, to his request.

6. And when Bhesika the barber perceived that the Exalted One had consented, he rose from his seat, and passing the Exalted One with his right hand towards him, went to Lohikka the Brahman, and on his arrival spake to him thus:

'We addressed that Exalted One, Sir, in your name, even as you commanded. And the Exalted One hath consented to come.'

7. Then Lohikka the Brahman, when the night had passed made ready at his own dwelling place sweet food, both hard and soft, and said to Bhesika the barber: 'Come now, good Bhesika, go where the Samana Gotama is staying, and on your arrival, announce the time to him, saying: "It is time, O Gotama, and the meal is ready."

'Very well, Sir', said Bhesika the barber in assent to the words of Lohikka the Brahman; and did so even as he had been enjoined.

And the Exalted One, who had robed himself early in the morning, went robed, and carrying his bowl with him, with the brethren of the Order, towards Salavatika.

8. Now, as he went, Bhesika the barber walked step by step, behind the Exalted One. And he said to him:

'The following wicked opinion has occurred to Lohikka the Brahman; "Suppose that a Samana or a Brahmana have reached up to some good state (of mind), then he should tell no one else about it. For what can one man do for another? To tell others would be like the man who, having broken through an old bond, should entangle himself in a new one. Like that, I say, is this (desire to declare to others); it is a form of lust", Twere well, Sir, if the Exalted One would disabuse his mind thereof. For what can one man do for another?'

'That may well be, Bhesika, that may well be.'

9. And the Exalted One went on to the dwelling-place of Lohikka the Brahman, and sat down on the seat prepared for him. And Lohikka the Brahman satisfied the Order, with the Buddha at its head,

with his own hand, with sweet food both hard and soft, until they refused any more. And when the Exalted One had finished his meal, and had cleansed the bowl and his hands, Lohikka the Brahman brought a low seat and sat down beside him. And to him, thus seated the Exalted One spake as follows:

‘Is it true what they say, Lohikka, that the following wicked opinion has arisen in your mind; (and he set forth the opinion as above set forth)?’

‘That is so Gotama.’

10. ‘Now what think you, Lohikka? Are you not established at Salavatika?’

‘Yes, that is so, Gotama.’

‘Then suppose, Lohikka, one were to speak thus: “Lohikka the Brahman has domain at Salavatika. Let him alone enjoy all the revenue and all the produce of Salavatika, allowing nothing to anybody else!” Would the utterer of that speech be danger-maker as touching the men who live in dependance upon you, or not?’

‘He would be danger-maker, Gotama.’

‘And making that danger, would he be a person who sympathised with their welfare, or not?’

‘He would not be considering their welfare, Gotama.’

‘And not considering their welfare, would his heart stand fast in love towards them, or in enmity?’

‘In enmity, Gotama.’

‘But when one’s heart stands fast in enmity, is that unsound doctrine, or sound?’

‘It is unsound doctrine, Gotama.’

‘Now if a man hold unsound doctrine, Lohikka, I declare that one of two future births will be his lot, either purgatory or rebirth as an animal.’

11. ‘Now what think you Lohikka? Is not King Pasenadi of Kosala in possession of Kasi and Kosala?’

‘Yes, that is so, Gotama.’

‘Then suppose, Lohikka, one were to speak thus: “King Pasenadi of Kosala is in possession of Kasi and Kosala. Let him enjoy all the revenue and all the produce of Kasi and Kosala, allowing nothing to anybody else.” Would the utterer of that speech be a danger-maker as touching the men who live in dependance on King Pasenadi of Kosala—both you yourself and others or not?’

‘He would be danger-maker Gotama.’

‘And making that danger, would he be a person who sympathised with their welfare, or not?’

‘He would not be considering their welfare, Gotama.’

‘And not considering their welfare, would his heart stand fast in love toward them, or in enmity?’

‘In enmity, Gotama.’

‘But when one’s heart stands fast in enmity, is that unsound doctrine, or sound?’

‘It is unsound doctrine, Gotama.’

‘Now if a man hold unsound doctrine, Lohikka, I declare that one of two future births will be his lot, either purgatory or rebirth as an animal.

12 and 14. ‘So then, Lohikka, you admit that he who should say that you, being in occupation of Salavatika, should therefore, yourself enjoy all the revenue and produce thereof, bestowing nothing on any one else; and he who should say that King Pasenadi of Kosala, being in power over Kasi and Kosala, should therefore himself enjoy all the revenue and produce thereof, bestowing nothing on any one else—would be making danger for those living in dependence upon you; or for those you and others living in dependence upon the King. And that those who thus make danger for others, must be wanting in sympathy for them. And that the man wanting in sympathy has his heart set fast in enmity. And that to have one’s heart set fast in enmity is unsound doctrine.

13 and 15. ‘Then just so, Lohikka, he who should say: “Suppose a Samana or a Brahmana to have reached up to some good state (of mind), then should he tell no one else about it. For what can one man do for another? To tell others would be like the man who, having broken through an old bond, should entangle himself in a new one. Like that, I say, is this desire to declare to others, it is a form of lust;”—just so he, who should say, thus, would be putting obstacles in the way of those clansmen who, having taken upon themselves the Doctrine and Discipline set forth by Him-who-has-won-the-Truth, have attained to great distinction therein—to the fruit of conversion, for instance, or to the fruit of once returning, or to the fruit of never returning, or even to Arhatship—he would be putting obstacles in the way of those who are bringing to fruition the course of conduct that will lead to rebirth in states of bliss in heaven. But putting obstacles in their way he would be out of sympathy for their welfare; being out of sympathy for their welfare his heart would become established in enmity; and when one’s heart is established in enmity, that is unsound doctrine. Now if a man hold unsound doctrine, Lohikka, I declare that one of two future births will be his lot, either purgatory or rebirth as an animal.

16. 'There are these three sorts of teachers in the world, Lohikka, who are worthy of blame; And whosoever should blame such a one, his rebuke would be justified, in accord with the facts and the truth, not improper. What are the three?

'In the first place, Lohikka, there is a sort of teacher who has not himself attained to that aim of Samanaship for the sake of which he left his home and adopted the homeless life. Without having himself attained to it he teaches a doctrine (Dhamma) to his hearers, saying: "This is good for you, this will make you happy." Then those hearers of his neither listen to him, nor give ear to his words, nor become steadfast in heart through their knowledge thereof; they go their own way, apart from the teaching of the master. Such a teacher may be rebuked, setting out these facts, and adding: "You are like one who should make advances to her who keeps repulsing him, or should embrace her who turns her face away from him. Like that, do I say, is this lust of yours (to go on posing as a teacher of men, no one heeding, since, they trust you not). For what, then, can one man do for another?"

'This, Lohikka, is the first sort of teacher in the world worthy of blame. And whosoever should blame such a one, his rebuke would be justified, in accord with the facts and the truth, not improper.

17. 'In the second place, Lohikka, there is a sort of teacher who has not himself attained to that aim of Samanship for the sake of which he left his home and adopted the homeless life. Without having himself attained to it he teaches a doctrine to his hearers, saying: "This is good for you; that will make you happy." And to him his disciples listen; they give ears to his words; they become steadfast in heart by their understanding what is said; and they go not their own way, apart from the teaching of the master. Such a teacher may be rebuked, setting out these facts and adding: "You are like a man who, neglecting his own field, should take thought to weed out his neighbour's field. Like that, do I say, is this lust of yours (to go on teaching others when you have not taught yourself). For what, then, can one man do for another?"

This, Lohikka, is the second sort of teacher in the world worthy of blame. And whosoever should blame such a one, his rebuke would be justified, in accord with the facts and the truth not improper.

18. And again, Lohikka, in the third place, there is a sort of teacher who has himself attained to that aim of Samanaship for the sake of which he left his home and adopted the homeless life. Having himself attained it, he teaches the doctrine to his hearers, saying: "This is good for you, that will make you happy." But those hearers of

his neither listen to him, nor give ear to his words, nor become steadfast in heart through understanding thereof; they go their own way, apart from the teaching of the master. Such a teacher may be rebuked, setting out these facts, and adding; "You are like a man who, having broken through an old bond, should entangle himself in a new one." Like that, do I say, is this lust of yours (to go on teaching when you have not trained yourself to teach). For what, then, can one man do for another?"

'This, Lohikka, is the third sort of teacher in the world worthy of blame. And whosoever should blame such a one, his rebuke would be justified, in accord with the facts and the truth, not improper. And these, Lohikka, are the three sorts of teachers of which I spoke.'

19. 'And when he had thus spoken, Lohikka, the Brahman spake thus to the Exalted One:

'But is there, Gotama, any sort of teacher not worthy of blame in the world?'

'Yes, Lohikka, there is a teacher not worthy, in the world of blame.'

'And what sort of a teacher, Gotama, is so?'

(The answer is in the words of the exposition set out above in the Samanna-phala, as follows:

1. The appearance of a Tathagata (one who won the truth), his preaching, the conversion of a hearer, his adoption of the homeless state.
2. The minor details of mere morality that he practises.
3. The Confidence of heart he gains from this practice.
4. The paragraph on 'Guarded is the door of his Senses.'
5. The paragraph on 'Mindful and Self-possessed.'
6. 'The paragraph on Simplicity of Life, being content with little.
7. The paragraphs on Emancipation, ill-temper, laziness, worry and perplexity.
8. The paragraph on the Joy and Peace that, as a result of this emancipation, fills his whole being.
9. The paragraphs on the Four Raptures (Ghanas).
10. The paragraphs on the Insight arising from Knowledge (the knowledge of the First Path).
11. The paragraphs on the Realisation of the Four Noble Truths the destruction of the Intoxications—lust, delusions, becoming, and ignorance—and the attainment of Arhatship.)

The refrain through and the closing paragraph is:

'And whosoever the teacher be, Lohikka, under whom the disciple attains to distinction so excellent as that, that, Lohikka is a teacher

not open to blame in the world. And whosoever should blame such a one, his rebuke would be unjustifiable, not in accord either with the facts or with the truth, without good ground.'

78. And when he had thus spoken, Lohikka the Brahman said to the Exalted One:

'Just, Gotama, as if a man had caught hold of a man, falling over the precipitous edge of purgatory, by the hair of his head and lifted him up safe back on the firm land—just so have I, on the point of falling into purgatory, been lifted back on to the land by the Venerable Gotama. Most excellent, O Gotama, are the words of thy mouth, most excellent? Just as if a man were to set up what has been thrown down, or were to reveal what has been hidden away, or were to point out the right road to him who has gone astray, or were to bring a light into the darkness so that those who had eyes could see external forms—just even so has the truth been made known to me, in many a figure, by the Venerable Gotama. And I, even I, betake myself to the Venerable Gotama as my guide, to the Doctrine and to the Order. May the Venerable Gotama accept me as a disciple; as one who, from this day forth as long as life endures, has taken him as his guide!'

□ □



## CHAPTER 9

### The Decline and Fall of Buddhism.

*Dr. B. R. Ambedkar had written "The Decline and Fall of Buddhism"; as a part of the treatise, 'Revolution and Counter-Revolution'. We have found only 5 pages in our papers which were not even corrected. Copy of this essay has been received from Shri S. S. Rege, which shows some corrections in Dr. Ambedkar's handwriting. This essay is of 18 typed pages which is included here.—'*  
Editors.

#### I

The disappearance of Buddhism from India has been a matter of great surprize to everybody who cares to think about the subject and is also a matter of regret. But it lives in China, Japan, Burma, Siam, Annam, Indo-China, Ceylon and parts of Malaya-Archipalego. In India alone, it has ceased to exist. Not only it has ceased to live in India but even the name of Buddha has gone out of memory of most Hindus. How could such a thing have happened? This is an important question for which there has been no satisfactory answer. Not only there is no satisfactory answer, nobody has made an attempt to arrive at a satisfactory answer. In dealing with this subject people fail to make a very important distinction. It is a distinction between the fall of Buddhism and the decline of Buddhism. It is necessary to make this distinction because the fall of Buddhism is one, the reasons for which are very different from those which brought about its downfall. For the fall is due to quite obvious causes while the reasons for its decline are not quite so obvious.

There can be no doubt that the fall of Buddhism in India was due to the invasions of the Musalmans. Islam came out as the enemy of the 'But'. The word 'But' as everybody knows is an Arabic word and means an idol. Not many people however know what the derivation of the word 'But' is. 'But' is the Arabic corruption of Buddha. Thus the origin of the word indicates that in the Moslem mind idol worship

had come to be identified with the Religion of the Buddha. To the Muslims, they were one and the same thing. The mission to break the idols thus became the mission to destroy Buddhism. Islam destroyed Buddhism not only in India but wherever it went. Before Islam came into being Buddhism was the religion of Bactria, Parthia, Afghanistan, Gandhar and Chinese Turkestan, as it was of the whole of Asia.<sup>1</sup> In all these countries Islam destroyed Buddhism. As Vicent Smith<sup>2</sup> points out :

“The furious massacre perpetrated in many places by Musalman invaders were more efficacious than Orthodox Hindu persecutions, and had a great deal to do with the disappearance of Buddhism in several provinces (of India),”

Not all will be satisfied with this explanation. It does seem inadequate. Islam attacked both, Bramhanism and Buddhism. It will be asked why should one survive and the other perish. The argument is plausible but not destructive of the validity of the thesis. To admit that Bramhanism survived, it does not mean that the fall of Buddhism was not due to the sword of Islam. All that it means is that, there were circumstances which made it possible for Bramhanism and impossible for Buddhism to survive the onslaught of Islam. Fortunately for Bramhanism and unfortunately for Buddhism that was the fact.

Those who will pursue the matter will find that there were three special circumstances which made it possible for Bramhanism and impossible for Buddhism to survive the calamity of Muslim invasions. In the first place Bramhanism at the time of the Muslim invasions had the support of the State. Buddhism had no such support. What is however more important is the fact that this State support to Bramhanism lasted till Islam had become a quiet religion and the flames of its original fury as a mission against idolatry had died out. Secondly the Buddhist priesthood perished by the sword of Islam and could not be resuscitated. On the other hand it was not possible for Islam to annihilate the Bramhanic priesthood. In the third place the Buddhist laity was persecuted by the Bramhanic rulers of India and to escape this tyranny the mass of the Buddhist population of India embraced Islam and renounced Buddhism.

Of these circumstances there is not one which is not supported by history.

Among the Provinces of India which came under Muslim domination, Sind was the first. It was ruled by a Shudra king. But the throne was usurped by a Bramhin who established his own dynasty

<sup>1</sup> Modern researches go to show that Buddhism had spread over Europe and that the Celts in Britain were Buddhist—See “Buddhism in pre-Christian Britain” by Donald A. Mackenzie.

<sup>2</sup> Early History of India (1924) pages.

which naturally supported the Bramhanic religion at the time of the invasion of Sind by Ibne Kassim in 712 A.D. The ruler of Sind was Dahir. This Dahir belonged to the dynasty of Brahmin rulers.

Heuen Tsang had noticed that the Punjab was in his time ruled by a Kshatriya Buddhist dynasty. This dynasty ruled Punjab till about 880 A.D. In that year the throne was usurped by a Brahmin army commander by name Lalliya who founded the Brahmin Shahi dynasty. This dynasty ruled the Punjab from 880 A.D. to 1021 A.D. It will thus be seen that at the time when the invasions of the Punjab were commenced by Sabuktagin and Mohammad, the native rulers belonged to the Bramhanic religion and Jayapala (960-980 A.D.) Anandpal (980-1000 A.D.) and Trilochanpal (1000-21 A.D.) of whose struggles with Sabuktagin and Mahammad we read so much were rulers belonging to the Bramhanic faith.

Central India began to be infested by Muslim invasions which commenced from the time of Mohammad and continued under the leadership of Shahabuddin Ghori. At that time Central India consisted of different kingdoms. Mewad (now known as Udepur) ruled by the Gulohits, Sambhar (now divided into Bundi, Kota and Sirohi) ruled by the Chauhans, Kanauj<sup>1</sup> ruled by the Pratihars, Dhar ruled by the Parmars, Bundelkhand ruled by Chandellas, Anhilwad ruled by the Chavdas, Chedi ruled by the Kalachuris. Now the rulers of all these kingdoms were Rajputs and the Rajputs for reasons which are mysterious and which I will discuss later on had become the staunchest supporters of the Bramhanic religion.

About the time of these invasions Bengal had fallen into two kingdoms, Eastern and Western. West Bengal was ruled by the Kings of the Pal dynasty and East Bengal was ruled by the Kings of the Sena dynasty.

The Palas were Kshatriyas. They were Buddhist but as Mr. Vadiya says<sup>2</sup> "probably only in the beginning or in name". As to the Sena kings there is a difference of opinion. Dr. Bhandarkar says they were Brahmins who had taken to the military profession of the Kshatriyas. Mr. Vaidya insists that the Sena Kings were Aryan Kshatriyas or Rajputs belonging to the Lunar race. In any case there is no doubt that the Senas like the Rajputs were supporters of the orthodox faith.<sup>3</sup>

"South of the river Nerbudda, then existed about the time of the Muslim invasions four kingdoms (1) The Deccan Kingdom of Western Chalukyas, (2) The Southern Kingdom of the Cholas (3) The Silahara

<sup>1</sup> Nothing remains of Kanauj. It was completely destroyed by Mohammad although it was most gallantly defended by Prithviraj.

<sup>2</sup> History of Medieval Hindu India Vol. II. p. 142.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid Vol. III. Chap. x.

Kingdom in Konkan on the West Coast and (4) The Ganga Kingdom of Trikalanga on the East Coast. These Kingdoms flourished during 1000-1200 A.D. which is the period of the Muslim invasions. There were under them, certain feudatory Kingdoms which rose to power in the 12th Century A.D. and which became independent and powerful in the 13th Century. They are (1) Devagiri ruled by the Yadavas, (2) Warangal ruled by Kakatiyas (3) Halebid ruled by Hoysalas (4) Madura ruled by the Pandyas and (5) Travancore ruled by the Cheras.

All these ruling dynasties were followers of orthodox Brahmanism.

The Muslim invasions of India commenced in the year 1001 A.D. The last wave of these invasions reached Southern India in 1296 A.D. when Allauddin Khilji subjugated the Kingdom of Devagiri. The Muslim conquest of India was really not completed by 1296. The wars of subjugation went on between the Muslim conquerors and the local rulers who though defeated were not reduced. But the point which requires to be borne in mind is that during this period of 300 years of Muslim Wars of conquests, India was governed all over by princes who professed the orthodox faith of Brahmanism. Brahmanism beaten and battered by the Muslim Invaders could look to the rulers for support and sustenance and did get it. Buddhism beaten and battered by the Muslim invaders had no such hope. It was an orphan and it withered in the cold blast of the native rulers and was consumed in the fire lit up by the conquerors.

The Musalman invaders sacked the Buddhist Universities of Nalanda, Vikramasila, Jagaddala, Odantapuri to name only a few. They raised to the ground Buddhist monasteries with which the country was studded. The Monks fled away in thousands to Nepal, Tibet and other places outside India. A very large number were killed outright by the Muslim commanders. How the Buddhist priesthood perished by the sword of the Muslim invaders has been recorded by the Muslim historians themselves. Summarizing the evidence relating to the slaughter of the Buddhist Monks perpetrated by the Musalman General in the course of his invasion of Bihar in 1197 A.D. Mr. Vincent Smith says<sup>1</sup> :

“The Musalman General, who had already made his name a terror by repeated plundering expeditions in Bihar, seized the capital by a daring stroke. The almost contemporary historian met one of the survivors of the attacking party in A.D. 1243, and learned from him that the Fort of Bihar was seized by a party of only two hundred horsemen, who boldly rushed the postern gate and gained possession of the place. Great quantities of plunder were obtained,

<sup>1</sup> Early History of India (1924) pp. 419-420.

and the slaughter of the 'shaven headed Brahmins', that is to say the Buddhist monks, was so thoroughly completed, that when the victor sought for some one capable of explaining the contents of the books in the libraries of the monasteries, not a living man could be found who was able to read them. 'It was discovered', we are told, 'that the whole of that fortress and city was a college, and in the Hindi tongue they call a college Bihar.'

Such was the slaughter of the Buddhist priesthood perpetrated by the Islamic invaders. The axe was struck at the very root. For by killing the Buddhist priesthood Islam killed Buddhism. This was the greatest disaster that befell the religion of Buddha in India. Religion like any other ideology can be attained only by propaganda. If propaganda fails, religion must disappear. The priestly class, however detestable it may be, is necessary to the sustenance of religion. For it is by its propaganda that religion is kept up. Without the priestly class religion must disappear. The sword of Islam fell heavily upon the priestly class. It perished or it fled outside India. Nobody remained to keep the flame of Buddhism burning.

It may be said that the same thing must have happened to the Brahmanic priesthood. It is possible, though not to the same extent. But there is this difference between the constitution of the two religions and the difference is so great that it contains the whole reason why Brahmanism survived the attack of Islam and why Buddhism did not. This difference relates to the constitution of the clergy.

The Brahmanic priesthood has a most elaborate organization. A clear and succinct account of it has been given by the late Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar in the pages of the *Indian Antiquary*.<sup>1</sup>

'Every Brahmanic family,' he writes, 'is devoted to the study of a particular Veda, and a particular Sakha (recension) of a Veda; and the domestic rites of the family are performed according to the ritual described in the Sutra connected with that Veda. The study consists in getting by heart the books forming the particular Veda. In Northern India, where the predominant Veda is the White Yagush and the Sakha that of the Madhyandinas, this study has almost died out, except at Banaras, where Brahmanic families from all parts of India are settled. It prevails to some extent in Gujarat, but to a much greater extent in the Maratha country; and in Tailangana there is a large number of Brahmins who still devote their life to this study. Numbers of these go about to all parts of the country in search of dakshina (fee, alms), and all well-to-do natives patronize them according to their means, by getting them to repeat portions of

<sup>1</sup> *Indian Antiquary* 1874, p. 132 quoted by Max Muller, *Hibbert Lectures* (1878) pp. 162-164.

their Veda, which is mostly the Black Yagush, with Apastamba for their Sutra. Hardly a week passes here in Bombay in which no Tailangana Brahman comes to me to ask for dakshina. On each occasion I get the men to repeat what they have learned, and compare it with the printed texts in my possession.

‘With reference to their occupation, Brahmans of each Veda are generally divided into two classes, Grihasthas and Bhikshukas. The former devote themselves to a worldly avocation, while the latter spend their time in the study of their sacred books and the practice of their religious rites.

‘Both these classes have to repeat daily the Sandhya-vandana or twilight-prayers, the forms of which are somewhat different for the different Vedas. But the repetition of the Gayatri-mantra ‘Tat Savitur Varenyam’ etc., five, then twenty eight, or a hundred and eight times, which forms the principal portion of the ceremony, is common to all.

‘Besides this, a great many perform daily what is called Brahmayagna, which on certain occasions is incumbent on all. This for the Rig-Veda consists of the first hymn of the first mandal, and the opening sentences of the Aitareya Brahmana, the five parts of the Aitereya Aranyaka, the Yagus-samhita, the Sama-samhita, the Atharva-samhita, Asvalayana Kalpa Sutra, Nirukta, Khandas, Nighantu, Jyotisha, Siksha, Panini, Yagnavalkya Smriti, Mahabharata, and the Sutras of Kanada, Jaimini, and Badarayan.’

The point to be remembered is that in the matter of officiation there is no distinction between a Bhikshuka<sup>1</sup> and a Grahastha. In Brahmanism both are priest and the Grahastha is no less entitled to officiate as a priest than a Bhikshu is. If a Grahastha does not choose to officiate as a priest, it is because he has not mastered the mantras and the ceremonies or because he follows some more lucrative vocation. Under Brahmanic dispensation every Brahmin who is not an outcast has the capacity to be a priest. The Bhikshuka is an actual priest, a Grahastha is a potential priest. All Brahmins can be recruited to form the army of Brahmanic priesthood. Further no particular training or initiation ceremony is necessary for a Brahmin to act as a priest. His will to officiate is enough to make him function as a priest. In Brahmanism the priesthood can never become extinct. Every Brahmin is a potential priest of Brahmanism and be drafted in service

<sup>1</sup> The Bhikshuks (under Brahmanism) are further sub-divided into (1) Vaidikas (2) Yajniks (3) Srotriyas and (4) Agnihotris. Vaidikas are those who learn the Vedas by heart and repeat them without a mistake. Yajnikas are those who perform Yajnas and other religious rites and ceremonies. Srotriyas are those who specialize in the art of performing great sacrifices. Agnihotris are those who maintain the three sacrificial fires and perform the Ishtis (fortnightly sacrifices) and Chaturmasyas (sacrifices to be performed every four months).

when the need be. There is nothing to stop the rake's life and progress. This is not possible in Buddhism. A person must be ordained in accordance with established rites by priests already ordained, before he can act as a priest. After the massacre of the Buddhist priests, ordination became impossible so that the priesthood almost ceased to exist. Some attempt was made to fill the depleted ranks of the Buddhist priests. New recruits for the priesthood had to be drawn from all available sources. They certainly were not the best. According to Haraprasad Shastri,<sup>1</sup>

"The paucity of Bhiksus brought about a great change in the composition of the Buddhist priesthood. It was the married clergy with families, who were called Aryas, that took the place of the Bhiksus proper, and began to cater to the religious needs of the Buddhists generally. They commenced attaining the normal status of Bhiksus through the performance of some sacraments. (Intro.pp.19.7, quoting Tatakara Guptas' Adikarmaracana : 149, pp.1207-1208). They officiated at the religious ceremonies but at the same time, in addition to their profession of priesthood, earned their livelihood through such avocations as those of a mason, painter, sculptor, goldsmith, and carpenter. These artisan priests who were in later times larger in numbers than the Bhiksus proper became the religious guides of the people. Their avocations left them little time and desire for the acquisition of learning, for deep thinking, or for devotion to Dhyana and other spiritual exercises. They could not be expected to raise the declining Buddhism to a higher position through their endeavours nor could they check its course towards its ruin through the introduction of salutary reforms."

It is obvious that this new Buddhist priesthood had neither dignity nor learning and were a poor match for the rival, the Brahmins whose cunning was not unequal to their learning.<sup>2</sup>

The reason why Brahmanism rose from the ashes and Buddhism did not, is to be accounted for, not by any inherent superiority of Brahmanism over Buddhism. It is to be found in the peculiar character of their priesthood. Buddhism died because its army of priests died and it was not possible to create. Though beaten it was never completely broken. Every Brahmin alive became priest and took the place of every Brahmin priest who died.

<sup>1</sup> Summary of his views by Narendra Nath Law in Harprasad Shastri Memorial Volume pp. 363-64.

<sup>2</sup> The reason why the new Buddhist priest could not leave their avocations and devote themselves wholly to the propagation of religion is because as Harprasad Shastri points out, "The decrease in the number of Buddhist laity also resulted in the difficulty of Buddhist monks to receive alms. As a monk could not take alms from more than three householders and could not visit the same household within a month for the same purpose, ninety household are necessary to maintain a monk". Harprasad Shastri Memorial Volume, p.362.

As to the conversion to the faith of Islam by the Buddhist population as a cause of the fall of Buddhism, there can hardly be much doubt.

In his Presidential address to the early Medieval and Rajput section of the Indian History Congress held at Allahabad in 1938, Prof. Surendra Nath Sen very rightly observed that there were two problems relating to the Medieval History of India for which no satisfactory answers were forthcoming as yet. He mentioned two: one connected with the origin of the Rajputs and the other to the distribution of the Muslim population in India. Referring to the second, he said:

“But I may be permitted to deal with one question that is not wholly of antiquarian interest today. The distribution of Muslim population in India demands some explanation. It is commonly believed that Islam followed the route of conquest and the subjugated people were forced to accept the faith of their rulers. The predominance of the Muslims in the Frontier Province and the Punjab lends some colour to this contention. But this theory cannot explain an overwhelming Muslim majority in Eastern Bengal. It is quite likely that the North-Western Frontier Province was peopled by Turkish folks during the Kushan days, and their easy conversion to Islam may be explained by racial affinity with the new conquerors; but the Muslims of Eastern Bengal are certainly not racially akin to the Turks and the Afghans, and the conversion of the Hindus of that region must have been due to other reasons.”<sup>1</sup>

What are these other reasons? Prof. Sen then proceeds to lay bare these reasons which are found in Muslim Chronicles. He takes the case of Sind for which there is direct testimony and says :<sup>2</sup>

“According to the Chachnama, the Buddhists of Sind suffered all sorts of indignities and humiliations under their Brahman rulers, and when the Arabs invaded their country, the Buddhists lent their whole hearted support to them. Later on, when Dahir was slain and a Muslim Government was firmly established in his country, the Buddhists found to their dismay that, so far as their rights and privileges were concerned, the Arabs were prepared to restore status quo ante bellum and even under the new order the Hindus received a preferential treatment. The only way out of this difficulty was to accept Islam because the converts were entitled to all the privileges reserved for the ruling classes. So the Buddhists of Sind joined the Muslim fold in large numbers.”

Prof. Sen then adds this significant passage :

<sup>1</sup> Early Career of Kanhoji Angria and other papers. pp.188-89.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.188-89.



“It cannot be an accident that the Punjab, Kashmir, the district around Behar Sharif, North-East Bengal where Muslims now predominate, were all strong Buddhist Centres in the pre-Muslim days. It will not be fair to suggest that the Buddhists succumbed more easily to political temptations than the Hindus and the change of religion was due to the prospects of the improvement of their political status.”

Unfortunately the causes that have forced the Buddhist population of India to abandon Buddhism in favour of Islam have not been investigated and it is therefore impossible to say how far the persecution of the Brahmanic Kings was responsible for the result. But there are not wanting indications which suggest that this was the principal cause. We have positive evidence of two Kings engaged in the campaign of persecuting the Buddhist population.

The first to be mentioned is Mihirkula. He belonged to the Huns who invaded India about 455 A.D. and established their kingdom in Northern India with Sakala, the modern Sialkot in the Punjab as the capital. Mihirkula ruled about 528 A.D. As Vincent Smith says:<sup>1</sup>

“All Indian traditions agree in representing Mihirkula as a blood thirsty tyrant. ‘The Attila of India’, stained to a more than ordinary degree with ‘implicable cruelty’ noted by historians as characteristic of the Hun temperament.”

Mihirkula, to use the language of Smith,<sup>2</sup> :-“exhibited ferocious hostility against the peaceful Buddhist cult, and remorselessly overthrew the *stupas* and monasteries, which he plundered of their treasures”.

The other is Sasanka, the King of Eastern India. He ruled about the first decade of the seventh century and was defeated in a conflict with Harsha. In the words of Vincent Smith<sup>3</sup>

“Sasanka, who has been mentioned as the treacherous murderer of Harsha’s brother, and probably was a scion of the Gupta dynasty, was a worshipper of Shiva, hating Buddhism, which he did his best to extirpate. He dug up and burnt the holy Bodhi tree at Buddha Gaya, on which, according to legend, Asoka had lavished inordinate devotion; broke the stone marked with the footprints of Buddha at Pataliputra; destroyed the convents, scattered the monks, carrying his persecutions to the foot of the Nepalese hills”.

The seventh century seems to be a century of religious persecution in India. As Smith points out:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Early History of India (1924) p. 336.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid p. 337.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid p. 360.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid F. N. p. 214.

“A terrible persecution of the cognate religion Jainism occurred in Southern India in the seventh century”.

Coming nearer to the time of the Muslim invasions, we have the instance of Sindh where presecution was undoubtedly the cause. That these persecutions continued upto the time of the Muslim invasions may be presumed by the fact that in Northern India the Kings were either Brahmins or Rajputs both of whom were anti Buddhists. That the Jains were persecuted even in the 12th century is amply supported by history. Smith refers to Ajayadeva, a Saiva King of Gujarat who came to the throne in A.D. 1174-6 and began his reign by a merciless persecution of the Jains, torturing their leader to death. Smith adds, “Several other well-established instances of severe persecution might be cited.”

There is therefore nothing to vitiate the conclusion that the fall of Buddhism was due to the Buddhist becoming coverts to Islam as a way of escaping the tyranny of Brahmanism. The evidence, if it does not support the conclusion, at least makes it probable. If it has been a disaster, it is a disaster for which Brahmanism must thank itself.

□ □

## CHAPTER 10

### Literature of Brahminism

*We have come across scattered pages of this essay, numbering from 6 to 14 and 17 to 39. These pages seem to be a continuation of the subject dealt with under the title 'The Decline and Fall of Buddhism'. Some of the pages are the first copies while the rest are the carbon copies. There are 14 more pages dealing with the Vedānta Sūtras and Bhagvat Gita. The size and quality of the paper on which 3 chapters i.e. (1) The Decline and Fall of Buddhism, (2) The Literature of Brahminism and (3) Vedānta Sūtras and Bhagvat Gita are typed, appear to be similar but distinct from the size and quality of other Chapters in this part.—Editors.*

#### I

The facts which supply the reasons must be gleaned from the literature of Brahmanism which grew up after its political triumph under Pushyamitra.

The literature falls under six categories (1) Manu Smṛiti (2) Gita (3) Shankaracharya's Vedānt (4) Mahābhārata (5) Rāmāyana and (6) the Purāṇas. In analysing this literature, I propose to bring out only such facts as are capable of being suggested by inference, the reason or reasons for the decline of Buddhism.

There is nothing unusual or unfair in this. For literature is the mirror in which the life of a people can be said to be reflected.

There is one point which I feel I must clear up. It relates to the period when this literature came into existence. Not all will agree that the literature referred to came into being after the revolution of Pushyamitra. On the contrary most Hindus, whether orthodox or not, learned or not, have an inerradicable belief that their sacred literature is a very old one in point of time. Indeed it seems to be an article of faith with every Hindu which necessitates a belief in a very high antiquity of their sacred literature.

As to the age of Manu I have given references to show that Manu Smriti was written by Sumati Bharagava after 185 B.C. i.e. after the Revolution of Pushyamitra. I need say nothing more on the subject.

The date of the Bhagavat Gita is a subject about which there has been a difference of opinion.

Mr. Telang was of opinion that the Geeta must be older than the third century B.C. though he was not able to say how much.

Mr. Tilak.....

In the opinion of Prof. Garbe,<sup>1</sup> the Geeta as we have it, is different from what it originally was. He agrees that the conviction that the Bhagwat Geeta has not reached us in its original form but has undergone essential transformations, is now, however, shared by many Indologists outside India. According to Prof. Garbe, one hundred and forty-six verses in the Bhagwat Geeta are new and do not belong to the original Geeta. As to the date of its composition Prof. Garbe says that it "cannot possibly be placed before the second Century A.D."

Prof. Kausambi insists that the Geeta was composed in the reign of King Baladitya. Baladitya belonged to the Gupta Dynasty which supplanted the Andhra Dynasty in the year..... Baladitya came to the throne in the year 467 A.D. His reasons for so late a date are two. Before Shankaracharya—who was born in 788 A.D. and who died in 820 A.D.—wrote his commentary on the Bhagwat Geeta, it was an unknown composition. It was certainly not mentioned in the *Tatvasangraha* by Shantarashit who wrote his treatise only 50 years before the advent of Shankaracharya. His second reason is this. Vasubandhu was the originator of a school of thought known as '*Vijnyan Vad*'. The *Bramha-Sutra-Bhashya* contains a criticism of the *Vijnyan Vad* of Vasubandhu. The Geeta contains a reference<sup>2</sup> to the *Bramha-Sutra-Bhashya*. The Geeta must therefore be after Vasubandhu and after the *Bramha-Sutra-Bhashya*. Vasubandhu was the preceptor of the Gupta King Baladitya. That being so, the Geeta must have been composed during or after the reign of Baladitya.

Nothing more need be said about the date of Shankaracharya. The age in which he lived and wrote is now generally accepted. Something about his life needs to be said. But I will reserve that for another place.

The question of determining the date of the composition of the Mahabharata is next to impossible. Only an attempt to fix the period of its composition can be made. The Mahabharat has undergone three editions and with each editor the title and subject matter has changed. In its original form it was known as '*Jaya*', Triumph. This original

<sup>1</sup> See his "Introduction to the Bhagvatgeeta" English Translation by Prof. Utgikar

<sup>2</sup> Geeta Adhya XIII. Shloka 4.

name occurs even in the third edition both in the beginning as well as in the end. The original edition of the book known as '*Jaya*' was composed by one Vyas. In its second edition it was known as Bharata. The Editor of this second edition was one Vaishampayana. Vaishampayan's edition was not the only second edition of the Bharata. Vyas had many pupils besides Vaishampayana; Sumantu, Jaimini, Paila and Shuka were his other four pupils. They all had learned at the feet of Vyas. Each one of them produced his own. Thus there were four other editions of Bharata. Vaishampayana recast the whole and brought out his own version. The third editor is Sauti. He recast Vaishampayana's version of Bharata. Sauti's version ultimately came to have the name of *Mahabharata*. The book has grown both in size and in the subject matter as well. The '*Jaya*' of Vyas was a small work having not more than 8800 Shlokas. In the hands of Vaishampayana it grew into 24000 verses. Sauti expanded it to contain 96836 Shlokas. As to subject matter the original as composed by Vyas was only a story of the war between the Kauravas and the Pandavas. In the hands of Vaishampayana the subject became two-fold. To the original story there was added the sermon. From a purely historical work, it became a diadactic work aiming to teach a right code of social, moral and religious duties. Sauti the last Editor made it an all-embracing repository of legendary lore. All the smaller floating legends and historical stories which existed independently of the Bharata were brought together by Sauti so that they might not be lost or that they may be found together. Sauti had another ambition, that was to make the Bharata a storehouse of learning and knowledge. This is the reason why he added sections on all branches of knowledge, such as politics, geography, archery etc. Taking into account Sauti's habit of repetition, it is no wonder that the Bharata in his hand became Mahabharata.

Now as to the date of its composition. There is no doubt that the war between the Kauravas and the Pandavas is a very ancient event. But that does not mean that the composition of Vyas is as old as the event or contemporaneous with the event. It is difficult to assign specific dates to the different editions. Taking it as a whole Prof. Hopkins says:¹

"The time of the whole Mahabharata generally speaking may then be from 200-400 A.D. This, however, takes into account neither subsequent additions, such as we know to have been made in later times, nor the various recasting in verbal form, which may safely be assumed to have occurred at the hands of successive copyists."

¹ Prof. Hopkins, "The Great Epic of India". p. 389.

But there are other circumstances which definitely point to a later date.

The Mahabharat contains a reference to the Huns. It was Skandagupta who fought the Huns and defeated them in or about the year 455 A.D.. Notwithstanding this the invasions of the Huns continued till 528 A.D. It is obvious that the Mahabharat was being written about his time or thereafter.

There are other indications which suggest a much later date. The Mahabharat refers to the Mlenchhas or the Muslims. In the 190th Adhyaya of the Vana Parva of the Mahabharat there is a verse 29 wherein the author says that "the whole world will be Islamic. All Yadnas, rites and ceremonies and religious celebrations will cease". This is a direct reference to the Muslims and although the verse speaks of what is to happen in the future, the Mahabharat being a Purana must as in the case of the Purana be taken to speak of the event that has happened. This verse so interpreted show that the Mahabharat was being written after the date of the Muslim invasions of India.

There are other references which point to the same conclusion.

In the same Adhyaya verse 59, it is said that "Oppressed by the Vrashalas, the Brahmins struck with fear and finding no one to protect them, will roam all over the world groaning and crying in agony".

The Vrashalas referred to in this verse cannot be the Buddhists. There is no particle of evidence that the Brahmins were ever oppressed. On the contrary the evidence is that the Brahmins, during the Buddhists regime, were treated with the same liberality as the Buddhist Bhikshus. The reference to the Vrashalas means the uncultured must be to the Islamic invaders.

There occur other verses in the same Adhyaya of the Vanaparva. They are 65, 66 and 67. In these verses it is said that, "Society will become disarranged. People will worship *Yedukas*. They will boycott Gods. The Shudras will not serve the twice-born. The whole world will be covered with *Yedukas*. The Yug will come to an end."

What is the meaning of the term '*Yedukas*'? By some it has been taken to mean a Buddhist *Chaitya*. But according to Mr. Kausambi<sup>1</sup> this is wrong. Nowhere either in the Buddhist literature or in the Vedic literature is the word *Yeduka* used in the sense of '*Chaitya*'. On the contrary according to the Amarkosh as commented upon by Maheshwar Bhatt the word *Yeduka* means a wall which contains a wooden structure to give it strength. So understood Kausambi contends that the word *Yeduka* must mean '*Idgaha*' of the Musalmans before which they say their prayers. If this is a correct interpretation

<sup>1</sup> Hindi Sanskriti Ani Ahimsa, p. 156.

then it is obvious that parts of the Mahabharata were written after the invasion of Mohammad Ghori. The first Muslim invasion took place in 712 A.D. under Ibne Kassim. He captured some of the towns in Northern India but did not cause much destruction. He was followed by Mohammad of Gazni. He caused great destruction of Temples and Viharas and massacred priests of both religions. But he did not engage himself in building Mosques or Idghas. That was done by Mohammad Ghori. From this it can be said that the writing of the Mahabharata was not complete till 1200 A.D.

It seems that like the Mahabharata, the Ramayana has also gone through three editions. There are two sort of references to the Ramayana in the Mahabharata. In one case the reference is to 'Ramayana' without any mention of the author. In other the reference is to the Ramayana of Valmiki. But the present Ramayana is not the Ramayana of Valmiki.<sup>1</sup> In the opinion of Mr. C. V. Vaidya<sup>2</sup>:

"That the present Ramayana, even as it is approved and adopted by the searching and all-respected commentator Kataka, is not the Ramayana originally written by Valmiki, not even the most orthodox thinker will be disposed to doubt. Whoever even cursorily reads the poem cannot but be struck with the inconsistencies, the severances of connections, juxta-positions of new and old ideas which abound so greatly in the present Ramayana, whether we take the Bengal or the Bombay text of it. And one cannot but come to the conclusion that the Ramayana of Valmiki was substantially reconstructed at some subsequent date."

As in the case of the Mahabharata there has been an accretion to the subject matter of the Ramayana. Originally it was just a story of the war between Rama and Ravana over the abduction of Rama's wife Sita by Ravana. In the second edition it became a story with a sermon. From a purely historical work it also became a didactic work aiming to teach a right code of Social, Moral and religious duties. When it assumed the form of a third edition it was, again, like the Mahabharat, made a repository of legends, knowledge, learning, philosophy and other arts and sciences.

With regard to the date of the composition of the Ramayana one proposition is well established namely that the episode of Rama is older than the episode of the Pandus. But that the composition of the Ramayana has gone on paripassu along with the composition of the Mahabharata. Portions of Ramayana may be earlier than the Mahabharata. But there can be no doubt that a great part of the

<sup>1</sup> Hopkins "The Great Epic of India", p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> The Riddle of the Ramayana Chap. II. p. 6.

Ramayana was composed after a great part of the Mahabharata had already been composed.<sup>1</sup>

(INCOMPLETE)

## II

The literature from which I propose to draw upon consists of (1) The Bhagwat Geeta (2) The Vedant Sutras (3) The Mahabharat (4) The Ramayana and (5) The Puranas. In analysing this literature I propose to bring out only such facts as are capable of being suggested by inference a reason or reasons for the decline of Buddhism.

Before proceeding to examine the subject matter of this literature I must deal with the question of the period when this literature came into existence. Not all will agree that the literature referred to came into being after the revolution of Pushyamitra. On the contrary most Hindus whether orthodox or not, learned or not, have an in-eradicable belief that their sacred literature is a very old one in point of time. Indeed it seems to be an article of faith with every Hindu which necessitates a belief in a very high antiquity of their sacred literature.

### (1) BHAGWAT GITA

Beginning with the Bhagwat Gita, the date of its composition has been a matter of controversy. Mr. Telang<sup>2</sup> was of opinion that we should "take the second century B.C. as a terminous before which the Gita must have been composed". The late Mr. Tilak<sup>3</sup> was convinced that the date of the present Gita must be taken as not later than 500 years before the Saka era" which means that the present Gita was composed somewhere about..... According to Prof. Garbe<sup>4</sup> the date of the composition of the Bhagwat Gita must be placed somewhere between 200 and 400 A.D. There is another view propounded by Mr. Kausambi and is based on quite indisputable data.

Prof. Kausambi insists that the Gita was composed in the reign of Gupta King Baladitya. Baladitya belonged to the Gupta dynasty which supplanted the Andhra Dynasty in the year..... Baladitya came to the throne in the year 467 A.D. His reasons for so late a date for the composition of the Gita are two. Before Sankaracharya—who was

<sup>1</sup> See the Appendix A to Hopkins "The Great Epic of India" for Parallel phrases in the two epics.

<sup>2</sup> Introduction to his translation of the Bhagwat Gita in the "Sacred Books of the East" Series.

<sup>3</sup> Gita-Rahasya (Eng. Translation) Vol.II p.800. According to Mr. Tilak the original Gita must have been some centuries earlier.

<sup>4</sup> Introduction to the Bhagwat Gita English Translation by Prof. Utgikar.



born in 788 A.D. and who died in 820 A.D.—wrote his commentary on the Bhagwat Gita, it was an unknown composition. It was certainly not mentioned in the *Tatvasangraha* by Shantarakshit who wrote his treatise only 50 years before the advent of Sankaracharya. His second reason is this. Vasubandhu was the originator of a school of thought known as '*Vijnan Vad*'. The Brahma-Sutra-Bhashya contains a criticism of the Vijnan Vad of Vasubandhu. The Gita contains a reference<sup>1</sup> to the Brahma-Sutra-Bhashya. The Gita must therefore be after Vasubandhu and after the Brahma-Sutra-Bhashya. Vasubandhu was the preceptor of the Gupta King Baladitya. That being so the Bhagwat Gita must have been composed or at any rate portions of Gita must have been added to the original edition during or after the reign of Baladitya i.e. about 467 A.D.

While there is a difference of opinion regarding the date of the composition of the Bhagwat Gita, there is no difference of opinion that the Bhagwat Gita has gone through many editions. All share the conviction that the Bhagwat Gita has not reached us in its original form but has undergone essential transformations at the hands of different editors who have added to it from time to time. It is equally clear that the editors through whose hands it has gone were not of equal calibre. As Prof. Garbe points out<sup>2</sup>

"The Gita is certainly 'no artistic work which the all comprehending vision of a genius has created.' The play of inspiration is indeed often times perceptible; not seldom, however, there are merely high-sounding, empty words with which an idea that has been already quite often explained, is repeated; and occasionally the literary expression is exceedingly faulty. Verses are bodily taken over from the Upanishad literature, and this is certainly what a poet filled with inspiration would never have done. The workings of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas are systematized with a truly Indian pedantry, and much indeed besides this could be brought forward to prove that the Gita is not the product of a genuinely poetic creative impulse..."

Hopkins speaks of the Bhagwat Gita as characteristic in its sublimity as in its puerilities, in its logic as in its want of it.... Despite its occasional power and mystic exaltation, the Divine Song in its present state as a poetical production is unsatisfactory. The same thing is said over and over again, and the contradictions in phraseology and meaning are as numerous as the repetitions, so that one is not surprised to find it described as "the wonderful song, which causes the hair to stand on end".

<sup>1</sup> Gita Adhayaya XIII. Shloka. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid p. 3.

This is not to be rejected as the view of foreigners. It is fully supported by Prof. Rajwade<sup>1</sup> who goes to show that some of those who had a hand in the composition of the Bhagwat Gita were ignorant of the rules of grammar.

While all are agreed that there have been different editions of the Gita under different editors, they are not agreed as to what parts of the Gita are original and what parts of the Gita are additions subsequently made. In the opinion of the late Rajaram Shastri Bhagwat the original Gita consisted only of 60 Shlokas. Humboldt was inclined to the view that originally the Gita consisted of only the first eleven Adhyayas (chapters) and that 12 to 18 Adhyayas were subsequent additions made to the original. Hopkins' view is that the first fourteen Adhyayas constitute the heart of the poem. Prof. Rajwade thinks that Adhyayas 10 and 11 are spurious. Prof. Garbe says that 146 verses in the Bhagwat Gita are new and do not belong to the original Gita which means that more than one-fifth of the Gita is new.

Regarding the author of the Gita there is none mentioned. The Gita is a conversation between Arjuna and Krishna which took place on the battle field, in which Krishna propounds his philosophy to Arjuna. The conversation is reported by Sanjaya to Dhritarashtra, the father of the Kauravas. The Gita should have been a part of the Mahabharata, for, the incident which formed the occasion for it, is natural to it, but it does not find a place there. It is a separate independent work. Yet there is no author to whom it is attributed. All that we know, is that Vyas asks Sanjaya to report to Dhritarashtra the conversation that took place between Arjuna and Krishna. One may therefore say that Vyas is the author of the Gita.

## (2) VEDANT SUTRAS

As has already been said, the Vedic literature consists of the Vedas, the Brahmanas, the Aranyakas, and the Upanishadas. From the point of their subject matter, this literature falls into two classes (1) literature which deals with religious observances and rites and ceremonies technically called Karma Kanda and (2) literature which deals with the knowledge about God to use the Vedic equivalent; the Brahmanas, technically called 'Gnanakanda'. The Vedas and the Brahmanas fall under the first category of literature, while the Aranyakas and the Upanishadas fall under the second.

This Vedic literature had grown to enormous proportions and what is important is that, it had grown in a wild manner. Some system,

<sup>1</sup> Bhandarkar Memorial Volume.

some coordination was necessary to bring order out of this chaos. As a result of the necessity for this coordination, there grew up a branch of inquiry called "Mimansa" i.e. an inquiry into the connected meaning of sacred texts i.e. the Vedic literature. Those who thought it necessary to undertake such a task of systematization and coordination divided themselves into two schools, those who systematized the '*Karmakand*' portion and these who systematized the '*Gnanakand*' portion of the Vedic literature. The result was that there grew up two branches of the Mimansa Shastra, one called *Purva Mimansa* and the other *Uttara Mimansa*. As the names suggest, the *Purva Mimansa* deals with the early portion of the Vedic literature namely the *Vedas* and the *Bramhanas*. That is why it is called *Purva* (early) *Mimansa*. The *Uttara Mimansa* deals with the later portions of the Vedic literature namely the *Aranyakas* and *Upanishads*. That is why it is called *Uttara* (later) *Mimansa*.

The literature connected with the two branches of the *Mimansa Shastra* is immense. Of this, two collections of *Sutras* stand out as the principal and leading works in this field of *Mimansa*. The authorship of one is attributed to *Jaimini* and that of the other is ascribed to *Badarayana*. *Jaimini's Sutras* deal with '*Karmakanda*' and *Badarayan's* deal with '*Gnanakand*'. There is no doubt that there were prior to *Jaimini* and *Badarayana*, other authors who had written treatises on these subjects. Nonetheless the *sutras* of *Jaimini* and *Badarayana* are taken as the standard works on the two Branches of the *Mimansa Shastra*.

Although the *Sutras* of both relate to that branch of inquiry called *Mimansa*, *Jaimini's sutras* are called *Mimansa Sutras*<sup>2</sup> while those of *Badarayana* are called *Vedanta Sutras*. The term '*Vedanta*' is taken to mean "the end of the *Veda*", or the doctrines set forth in the closing chapter of the *Vedas* which comprise the *Upanishads* and as the *Upanishads* constitute "the final aim of the *Vedas*." The *Sutras* of *Badarayana* which go to systematize and coordinate them have come to be called *Vedanta Sutras*,<sup>3\*</sup> or the doctrines set forth in the closing chapter of the *Vedas* which asked *Sanjaya* to report to. This is the origin of the *Vedanta Sutras*.

<sup>1</sup> As a matter of fact the systematization of the *Karmakand* portion of the Vedic literature gave rise to two kinds of works (1) *Kalpā Sutras* and (2) *Purva Mimansa Sutras*. The former give only a short and concise description of the rituals enjoined in the *Brahmanas*; while the latter enunciate and support the general principle which the author of the *Kalpa Sutra* must follow, if he wishes to render his rules strictly conformable to the teaching of the *Vedas*.

<sup>2</sup> They are also called *Purva Mimansa* or *Karma Mimansa*.

<sup>3</sup> They also go by various other names such as *Uttara Mimansa Sutras*, *Brahma Sutras* or *Saririka Sutras* or *Saririka Mimansa Sutras*.

Who is this Badarayana? Why did he compose these Sutras and when did he compose them? Beyond the name nothing is known about Badarayana.<sup>1</sup> It is not even certain that it is the real name of the author. There is a considerable uncertainty regarding the authorship of these Sutras even among his chief commentators. Some say that the author is Badarayana. Others say that the author of the Sutra is Vyas. The rest say that Badarayana and Vyas are one and the same person. Such is the bewildering conflict of opinion regarding the author of the Sutras.

Why did he compose these Sutras? That the Brahmins should undertake to systematize the Karmakand portion of the Vedic literature one can quite understand. The Brahmins were deeply concerned with the Karmakand. Their very existence, their livelihood depended upon the systematization of the Karmakand portion of the Vedic literature. The Brahmins on the other hand had no interest in the 'Gnankand' portion of the Vedic literature. Why should they have made an attempt to systematize it? The question has not even been raised. But it is an important question and the answer to that must also be very important. Why the question is important and what the answer is I shall discuss later on.

There are two other questions with regard to the Vedanta Sutras. First is this. Is this work theological in character or is it purely philosophical in its nature? Or is it an attempt to tie down pure philosophy to the apron strings of established theology and thereby to make it innocuous and harmless. The other question relates to the commentaries on the Vedanta Sutras. There have been altogether five commentaries on the Vedanta Sutras by five eminent men all of whom are called Acharyas (doctors of learning) by reason of their intellectual eminence. They are (1) Shankaracharya (788 A.D. to 820 A.D.), (2) Ramanujacharya (1017 A.D. to 1137 A.D.), (3) Nimbarkacharya (died about 1162 A.D.), (4) Madhavacharya (1197-1276 A.D.) and (5) Vallabhacharya (born 1417 A.D.). The commentaries of these Acharyas on the Vedanta Sutras have become far more important than the Vedanta Sutras. The point of some significance is that on the text of one and the same collection of the Vedanta Sutras, an attempt has been made by those five Acharyas to found five different systems of thought. According to Shankara, the Vedanta Sutras teach absolute monism. According to Ramanuja, qualified monism. According to

<sup>1</sup> The same is true of Jaimini. As Kane says "Hardly anything is known about Jaimini. There is a Brahmana, a Srauta Sutra and a Grihyasutra ascribed to Jaimini. But it is hardly likely that they are the works of the founder of the Purvamimamsa. In the *tarpana* in the Asvalayan Grihya Sutra Jaimini occurs along with Sumantu, Vaishyampayana. In the Bhagwat Purana Jaimini is said to be the teacher of Sumantu and a promulgator of Samaveda. The Panchatantra tells us that an elephant crushed to death Jaimini—the author of the Mimamsa. "A brief sketch of the Purva Mimamsa System". p. 12.

Nimbarka, monodualism. According to Madhava, dualism and according to Vallabha, pure monism. I will not discuss here what these terms mean. All I want to say is why should five different schools should have arisen as a result of five different interpretation of the same collection of Sutras. Is it a mere matter of grammar? Or is there any other purpose behind these several interpretations. There is also another question which arises out of the plurality of commentaries. While there are five different commentaries each propounding five different ways of looking at God and the individual soul really speaking there are only two, the view taken by Shankaracharya and the view taken by the other four. For though the four differ among themselves, they are all united in their opposition to Shankaracharya on two points (1) The complete oneness between God and individual soul and (2) the world is an illusion. Here comes the third question. Why did Shankaracharya propound so unique a view of the Vedanta Sutras of Badarayana? Is it the result of a critical study of the Sutras? Or is it a wishful interpretation designed to support a preconceived purpose?

I am only raising this question. I don't propose to deal with them here. Here I am concerned with the age of this literature, is it Pre-Buddhist or Post-Buddhist.

As to the date of the composition of the Vedanta Sutras the initial difficulty is that like the Bhagwat Gita it has also gone through several recensions. According to some<sup>1</sup> there have been three recensions of the Vedanta Sutras. That being so nothing definite can be said regarding the date of its composition.<sup>2</sup> The views expressed are only approximations. There can be no doubt that the Vedanta Sutras are composed after the rise of Buddhism for the Sutras do allude to Buddhism. They must not be after Manu for Manu refers to them in his Smriti. Prof. Keith holds that they must have been written about 200 A.D. and Prof. Jacobi believes that the Sutras must have been composed between 200 A.D. and 450 A.D.

### (3) MAHABHARATA

The question of determining the date of the composition of the Mahabharata is next to impossible. Only an attempt to fix the period of its composition can be made. The Mahabharata has undergone three editions and with each editor the title and subject matter has changed. In its original form it was known as '*Jaya*' Triumph. This

<sup>1</sup> See Belvalkar, Basu Mallick Lectures on Vedanta Lecture IV.

<sup>2</sup> See Radhakrishnan—Indian Philosophy Vol.II p. 430 where the relevant evidence is collected together.

original name occurs even in the third edition, both in the beginning as well as in the end. The original edition of the book known as '*Jaya*' was composed by one Vyas. In its second edition it was known as Bharata. The editor of this second edition was one Vaishampayana. Vaishampayana's Edition was not the only second edition of the Bharata. Vyas had many pupils besides Vaishampayana; Sumantu, Jaimini, Paila and Shuka were his other four pupils. They all had learned at the feet of Vyas. Each one of them produced his own edition. Thus there were four other editions of Bharata. Vaishampayana recast the whole and brought out his own version. The third Editor is Sauti. He recast Vaishampayana's version of Bharata. Sauti's version ultimately came to have the name of *Mahabharata*. The book has grown both in size and in the subject matter as well. The '*Jaya*' of Vyas was a small work having not more than 8,800 Shlokas. In the hands of Vaishampayana it grew into 24,000 verses. Sauti expanded it to contain 96,836 Shlokas. As to subject matter, the original as composed by Vyas was only a story of the war between the Kauravas and the Pandavas. In the hands of Vaishampayana the subject became two-fold. To the original story there was added the sermon. From a purely historical work it became a diadactic work aiming to teach a right code of social, moral and religious duties. Sauti the last Editor made it an all embracing repository of legendary lore. All the smaller floating legends and historical stories which existed independently of the Bharata were brought together by Sauti so that they might not be lost or that they may be found together. Sauti had another ambition, that was to make the Bharata a storehouse of learning and knowledge. This is the reason why he added sections on all branches of knowledge, such as politics, geography, archary etc. Taking into account Sauti's habit of repetition it is no wonder that the Bharata in his hand became Mahabharata.

Now as to the date of its composition. There is no doubt that the war between the Kauravas and the Pandavas is a very ancient event. But that does not mean that the composition of Vyas is as old as the event or contemporaneous with the event. It is difficult to assign specific dates to the different editions. Taking it as a whole Prof. Hopkins says:<sup>1</sup>

"The time of the whole Mahabharata generally speaking may then be from 200-400 A.D. This, however, takes into account neither subsequent additions, such as we know, to have been made in later times, nor the various recasting in verbal form, which may safely be assumed to have occurred at the hands of successive copyists."

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Hopkins, "The Great Epic of India". p. 389.

But there are other circumstances which definitely point to a later date.

The Mahabharata contains a reference to the Huns. It was Skandagupta who fought the Huns and defeated them in or about the year 455. Notwithstanding this, the invasions of the Huns continued till 528 A.D. It is obvious that the Mahabharata was being written about this time or thereafter.

There are other indications pointed out by Mr. Kausambi<sup>1</sup> which suggest a much later date. The Mahabharata refers to the Mlenchhas or the Muslims. In the 190th Adhyaya of the Vana Parva of the Mahabharata, there is a verse 29 wherein the author says that "the whole world will be Islamic. All Aryan rites and ceremonies and religious celebrations will cease". This is a direct reference to the Muslims and although the verse speaks of what is to happen in the future, the Mahabharata being a Purana must as in the case of the Purana be taken to speak of the event has happened. This verse so interpreted show that the Mahabharata was being written after the date of the Muslim invasions of India.

There are other references which point to the same conclusion.

In the same Adhyaya verse 59 it is said that "Oppressed by the Vrashalas, the Brahmins struck with fear, and finding no one to protect them will roam all over the world groaning and crying in agony".

The Vrashalas referred to in this verse cannot be the Buddhists. There is no particle of evidence that the Brahmins were ever oppressed. On the contrary the evidence is that the Brahmins during the Buddhist regimes were treated with the same liberality as the Buddhist Bhikshus. The reference to the Vrashalas which means the uncultured must be to the Islamic invaders. If that is so, then part of the Mahabharata was certainly composed after the Muslim invasions of India began.

There occur other verses in the same Adhyaya of the Vanaparva which points to the same conclusion. They are 65, 66 and 67. In these verses it is said that "Society will become disarranged. People will worship *Yedukas*. They will boycott Gods. The Shudras will not serve the twice born. The whole world will be covered with *Yedukas*. The Yug will come to an end".

Great significance attaches to the term '*Yedukas*'. By some it has been taken to mean a Buddhist *Chaitya*, on the ground that *Yeduka* means bone and particularly the bones of Buddha and subsequently *Chaitya* because a *Chaitya* contains the bones of the Buddha. But according to Mr. Kausambi<sup>2</sup> this is wrong. Nowhere either in the

<sup>1</sup> Hindi Sanskriti Ani Ahimsa (Marathi).

Buddhist literature or in the Vedic literature is the word Yeduka used in the sense of 'Chaitya'. On the contrary, according to Amarkosh as commented upon by Maheshwar Bhatt, the word Yeduka means a wall which contains a wooden structure to give it strength. So understood Kausambi contends that the word Yeduka must mean 'Idgaha' of the Musalmans before which they say their prayers. If this is a correct interpretation then it is obvious that part of the Mahabharata was written after the Muslim invasions, particularly after those of Mahamad Ghorī. The first Muslim invasion took place in 721 A.D. under Ibne Kassim. He captured some of the towns in Northern India but did not cause much destruction of Temples and Viharas and massacred priests of both the religions. But he did not engage himself in building Mosques or Idghas. That was done by Mahamad Ghorī. So that, it can well be said, that the writing of the Mahabharata was going on till 1200 A.D.

## RAMAYANA

It is a fact that like Mahabharata, the Ramayana has also gone through three editions. There are two sorts of references to the Ramayana in the Mahabharata. In one case the reference is to Ramayana without any mention of the author. The other reference is to the Ramayana of Valmiki. But the present Ramayana is not the Ramayana of Valmiki.<sup>1</sup> In the opinion of Mr. C. V. Vaidya<sup>2</sup> :

"That the present Ramayana, even as it is approved and adopted by the searching and all-respected commentator Kataka, is not the Ramayana originally written by Valmiki, not even the most orthodox thinker will be disposed to doubt. Whoever even cursorily reads the poem, cannot but be struck with the inconsistencies, the severances of connections, juxtapositions of new and old ideas which abound so greatly in the present Ramayana, whether we take the Bengal or the Bombay text of it. And one cannot but come to the conclusion that the Ramayana of Valmiki was substantially reconstructed at some subsequent date."

As in the case of the Mahabharata, there has been an accretion to the subject matter of the Ramayana. Originally it was just a story of the war between Rama and Ravana over the abduction of Rama's wife Sita by Ravana. In the second edition it became a story with a sermon. From a purely historical work, it also became a didactic work aiming to teach a right code of Social, Moral and religious duties. When it

<sup>1</sup> Hopkins "The Great Epic of India". p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> The Riddle of the Ramayana Chap. II. p. 6.



assumed the form of a third edition, it was again, like the Mahabharata, made a repository of legends, knowledge, learning, philosophy and other arts and sciences.

With regard to the date of the composition of the Ramayana, one proposition is well established namely that the episode of Rama is older than the episode of the Pandus. But that the composition of the Ramayana has gone on peripassu along with the composition of the Mahabharata. Portions of Ramayana may be earlier than the Mahabharata. But there can be no doubt that a great part of the Ramayana was composed after a great part of the Mahabharata had already been composed.<sup>1</sup>

## PURANAS

The Puranas<sup>2</sup> today number 18. This is however not the original number. According to traditions, there is no reason to doubt, there was only one Purana to start with. Tradition alleges that this Purana was older than the Vedas. The Atharva Veda refers to this *Purana* and the Bramhanda Puran says that it is more ancient than the Vedas. It was a lore which the King was expected to know for the Satapada. Bramhana says the Adhvaryu was required to recite the Purana to the King on the 10th day of the Yajna.

The origin of the 18 Puranas is attributed to Vyas who it is said recast the original single Purana and by additions and substractions made 18 out of one. The making of the 18 Puranas is thus the second stage in the evolution of the Puranas. The edition of each of these 18 Puranas as published or uttered by Vyas is called the Adi<sup>3</sup> Purana i.e. the original edition as brought out by Vyas. After Vyas composed these 18 Puranas, he taught them to his disciple Romaharsana. Romaharsana prepared his own edition of the Puranas and taught it to his six disciples. Romaharsana's edition of the Puranas thus became the third edition of the Puranas. Of the six disciples of Romaharsana, three: Kasyapa, Savarni and Vaisampayana, made three separate editions which may be called the fourth edition of the Puranas which we call by their names. According to the Bhavishya Purana, the Puranas came to be revised sometime during the reign of King Vikramaditya.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the Appendix A to Hopkins "The Great Epic of India" for Parallel phrases in the two epics.

<sup>2</sup> For the account of the Puranas which follows I have drawn upon Kale's Purananirikshana (Marathi) and Partigar's Ancient Indian Historical Tradition.

<sup>3</sup> Adi Purana does not mean a separate Purana of that name It means the first edition of each of the 18 Puranas.

<sup>4</sup> Who is Vikramaditya? No one can say.

As to the subject matter of the Puranas. The *Purana* from the oldest time is a recognised department of knowledge. For instance it was distinguished from Itihas or history. By Itihas what was understood was past occurrences connected with a ruling king. By *Akhyana* was meant the recital of an event the occurrence of which one had witnessed. By *Upakhyana* was meant the recital of something one has heard. *Gathas* meant songs about dead ancestors and about nature and universe.

*Kalpashudhi*<sup>1</sup> are ancient ways of acting regarding Shraddha and Kalpa.<sup>2</sup> The Purana was distinguished from all these branches of knowledge. The Purana was concerned with five subjects. (1) Sarga (2) Prati Sarga (3) Vamsha (4) Manvantar and (5) Vamshacharitra. Sarga means creation of the universe, Pratisarga means the dissolution of the Universe. Vamsha means Geneology, Manvantar means the Ages of the different Manus, particularly the fourteen successive Manus who were the progenitors or sovereigns of the Earth. Vamshacharitra means the account of royal dynasties.

There has been a considerable addition made in the scope and subject matter of the Puranas. For the Puranas which we have are no longer confined to these subjects. In addition to these subjects they contain other subjects which fall entirely outside their prescribed scope. Indeed there has been such a change in the fundamental notion regarding the scope of the Puranas so that some of them do not contain any treatment of the regular subjects but deal wholly with the new or extra subjects. The extra subjects include the following main topics :

(I) Smriti Dharma which include discussion of:

(1) Varnashrama-dharma, (2) Achara, (3) Ahnika, (4) Bhashyabhasya, (5) Vivaha, (6) Asaucha, (7) Shradha (8) Dravya-Suddhi (9) Pataka, (10) Prayaschitta, (11) Naraka, (12) Karma Vipaka and (13) Yuga Dharma.

(II) Vrata Dharma—Observance of holy vows and holy days

(III) Kshetra Dharma—Pilgrimages to holy places and

(IV) Dana Dharma—Gifts to holy persons.

In addition to this, there are two other topics the new subject matter with which one finds the Puranas to be deeply concerned.

The first of these two topics relates to sectarian worship. The Puranas are votaries of a particular deity and advocate the cause of

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hazara speaks of Kalpajukti (instead of Kalpashudhi) which means lore that has come down through ages—see chronology of Puranas p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> The word Kalpa is used in various senses. (1) Practicable, (2) Proper (3) Able, Competent. The word *Kalpa* is else used in various senses (1) A Sacred rule (2) A prescribed alternative (3) Made of performing religious rites (4) End of the world, Universal destruction, (5) A day of the Brahma Yuga (6) Medical treatment of the sick and (7) One of the six Vedangas; that which lays down the ritual and prescribes rules for ceremonies and sacrificial acts.

a particular deity and the sect devoted to his worship. Five<sup>1</sup> Puranas advocate worship of Vishnu, Eight<sup>2</sup> worship of Shiva, One<sup>3</sup> worship of Brahma, One<sup>4</sup> worship of Surya, Two worship of Devi and One worship of Genesh.

The second topic which the Puranas have made a part of their subject matter is the history of the Avatars of the God. The Puranas make a distinction between identification of two Gods and the incarnation of a God. In the case of identification, the theory is that the God is one although he has two names. In the case of an incarnation, God becomes another being of the man or brute and does something miraculous. In reading this history of incarnations the fruitful source is Vishnu. For it is only Vishnu who has taken Avatars from time to time and done miraculous deeds and we find in the Puranas this new topic discussed in all its elaborate details.

It is no wonder if by the addition of these new subjects, the Puranas have been transformed out of recognition.

There is one other matter regarding the authorship of the Puranas which is noteworthy. It relates to the change in the authorship of the Puranas. Among the ancient Hindus, there were two separate sections among the literary class. One section consisted of the *Brahmins* and another section called *Sutas* who were non-Brahmins. Each was in charge of a separate department of literature. The Sutas had the monopoly of the Puranas. The Brahmins had nothing to do with the composition or the reciting of the Puranas. It was exclusively reserved for the Sutas and the Brahmins had nothing to do with it. Though the Sutas had specialized themselves in the making and the reciting of the Puranas, although they had acquired a hereditary and a prescriptive right to compose and recite the Puranas, there came a time when the Sutas were ousted from this profession by Brahmins who took it into their own hands and made a monopoly of it in their own favour. Thus there was a change in the authorship of the Puranas. Instead of the Sutas, it is the Brahmins who became their authors.<sup>5</sup>

It is probably when the Puranas fell into the hands of the Brahmins that the Puranas have been finally edited and recast to make room for the new subjects. The editing and recasting has been of a very daring character. For in doing so they have added fresh chapters, substituted new chapters for old chapters and written new chapters with old names. So that by this process some Puranas retained their earlier

<sup>1</sup> (1) Vishnu (2) Bhagwat (3) Narada (4) Vaman and (5) Garuda.

<sup>2</sup> (1) Shiva (2) Brahma (3) Linga (4) Varaha (5) Skanda (6) Matsya (7) Kurma (8) Bramhanda.

<sup>3</sup> Padma.

<sup>4</sup> Agni.

<sup>5</sup> Partiger.

materials, some lost their early materials, some gained new materials and some became totally new works.

The determination of the date of the composition of the Puranas is a problem which has hardly been tackled. All history written by the Brahmins is history without dates and the Puranas are no exception. The date of the Puranas has to be determined by circumstantial evidence co-related with events the dates of which are well settled. The dates of the composition of the different Puranas have not been examined as closely as those of the other parts of the Brahmin literature. Indeed scholars have paid no attention to the Puranas, certainly nothing like what they have done in the matter of the other literature. Mr. Hazara's is the only work I know of in which an attempt is made in the matter of determining the date of the composition of the Puranas. I give below the dates of the Puranas found by him.

Puranas			Date of Composition
1.	Markendeya	.. ..	Between 200 and 600 A. D.
2.	Vayu	.. ..	Between 200 and 500 A. D.
3.	Bramhanda	.. ..	Between 200 and 500 A. D.
4.	Vishnu	.. ..	Between 100 and 350 A. D.
5.	Matsya	.. ..	Part about 325 A. D. Part about 1100 A. D.
6.	Bhagwat	.. ..	Between 500 and 600 A. D.
7.	Kurma	.. ..	Between 550 and 1000 A. D.
8.	Vamana	.. ..	Between 700 and 1000 A. D.
9.	Linga	.. ..	Between 600 and 1000 A. D.
10.	Varaha	.. ..	Between 800 and 1500 A. D.
11.	Padma	.. ..	Between 600 and 950 A. D.
12.	Brahanaradiya	.. ..	Between 875 and 1000 A. D.
13.	Agni	.. ..	Between 800 and 900 A. D.
14.	Garuda	.. ..	Between 850 and 1000 A. D.
15.	Bramha	.. ..	Between 900 and 1000 A. D.
16.	Skanda	.. ..	After 700 A. D.
17.	Bramha Vaivrata	.. ..	After 700 A. D.
18.	Bhavishya	.. ..	After 500 A. D.

No more precise date can be fixed for the Puranas at any rate at the present. New research in the field may narrow the higher and lower limits of their composition. The difference will only be a difference of degree. It will not be one of subversion of Eras.

This short survey is enough to remove any doubt as to the age of this literature that it is post-Buddhistic. The survey establishes one more point of great significance. This literature arose during the period subsequent to the triumph of Brahmins under the leadership of Pushyamitra. The survey brings out one other point. Vyas writes Mahabharata. Vyas tells Bhagwat Gita, and Vyas also writes the Puranas. Mahabharata contains 18 Parvas, the Gita has 18 Adhyayas and the Puranas number 18. Is all this an Accident? Or is it the result of a design planned and worked out in concert? We must wait and see.

### III

#### THE VEDANTA SŪTRAS

The vedanta Sutras of Badarayana as has been pointed out already constitute a department of study on the same line as the Karma Sutras of Jaimini. It is natural to ask how the founders of these two schools of thought comfort themselves towards each other. When one begins to inquire into the matter one comes across facts which are revealing. In the first place as Prof. Belvalkar<sup>1</sup> points out, 'the Vedanta Sutras are very closely modelled upon the Karma Sutras.' In the matter of methodology and terminology, Badarayana almost slavishly follows Jaimini. He accepts Jaimini rules of interpreting the text of the Shruti. He uses Jaimini's technical terms in the sense in which they have been used by Jaimini. He uses the very illustrations which are employed by Jaimini.

This is a matter for small wonder. But what is not a matter for small wonder is the attitude of the two schools towards each other in the matter of doctrine. Let me give an illustration.

Badarayana gives the following Sutras<sup>2</sup> as illustrative of the position of Jaimini towards the Vedanta.

2. Because (the Self) is supplementary (to sacrificial acts), (the fruits of the knowledge of the Self) are mere praise of the agent, even as in other cases; thus says Jaimini.

"According to Jaimini the Vedas merely prescribe acts to attain certain purposes including Liberation, and nothing more. He argues that the knowledge of the Self does not yield any independent results, as Vedanta holds, but is connected with the acts through the agent. No one undertakes a sacrificial act unless he is conscious of the fact that he is different from the body and that after death he

<sup>1</sup> Basu Mallick Lectures. p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> Swami Vireswarananda—Brahma Sutras (Advaita Ashram Edition 1936). pp. 408-411.

will go to heaven, where he will enjoy the results of his sacrifices. The Text dealing with Self-knowledge serve merely to enlighten the agent and so are subordinate to sacrificial acts. The fruits, however, which the Vedanta texts declare with regard to Self-knowledge, are merely praise, even as texts declare such results by way of praise, with respect to other matters. In short, Jaimini holds that by the knowledge that his Self will outlive the body, the agent becomes qualified for sacrificial actions, even as other things become fit in sacrifices through purificatory ceremonies.

3. Because we find (from the scriptures such) conduct (of men of realization).

“Janaka, emperor of Videha performed a sacrifice in which gifts were freely distributed” (Brih. 3.1.1.); “I am going to perform a sacrifice, Sirs” (Chh. 5.11.5.). Now both Janaka and Asvapati were knowers of the Self. If by this knowledge of the Self they had attained Liberation, there was no need for them to perform sacrifices. But the two texts quoted show that they did perform sacrifices. This proves that it is through sacrificial acts alone that one attains Liberation, and not through the knowledge of the Self, as the Vedantians hold.

4. That (viz, that knowledge of the Self stands in a subordinate relation to sacrificial acts) the scriptures directly declare,

“That alone which is performed with knowledge, faith and meditation becomes more powerful” (Chh. 1.1.10); This text clearly shows that knowledge is a part of the sacrificial act.

5. Because the two (knowledge and work) go together (with the departing soul to produce the results).

“It is followed by knowledge, work, and past experience” (Brih. 4.4.2.). This text shows that knowledge and work go together with the soul and produce the effect which it is destined to enjoy. Knowledge independently is not able to produce any such effect.”

6. Because (the scriptures) enjoin (work) for such (as know the purport of the Vedas).

“The scriptures enjoin work only for those who have a knowledge of the Vedas, which includes the knowledge of the Self. Hence knowledge does not independently produce any result.”

7. And on account of prescribed rules.

“Performing works here let a man wish to live a hundred years” (Is. 2.); “Agnihotra is a sacrifice lasting up to old age and death; for through old age one is freed from it or through death” (Sat. Br. 12.4.1.1.). From such prescribed rules also we find that Knowledge stands in a subordinate relation to work.

What is the position of Badarayana towards Jaimini and Karma Kanda Shastras? This is best illustrated by the reply which Badarayana gives to the attack by Jaimini on Vedanta as formulated by Badarayana in the Sutras quoted above. The reply is contained in the following Sutras :<sup>1</sup>

8. But because (the scriptures) teach (the Supreme Self to be) other (than the agent), Badarayana's (view is) correct; for that is seen (from the scriptures).

"Sutras 2-7 give the view of the Mimamsakas, which is refuted by Sutras 8-17.

The Vedanta texts do not teach the limited self, which is the agent, but the Supreme Self, which is different from the agent. Thus the knowledge of the Self which the Vedanta texts declare is different from that knowledge of the self which an agent possesses. The knowledge of such a Self, which is free from all limiting adjuncts, not only does not help, but puts an end to all actions. That the Vedanta texts teach the Supreme Self is clear from such texts as the following; "He who perceives all and knows all" (Mu. 1.1.9.); "Under the mighty rule of this immutable, O Gargi" etc. (Brih. 3.8.9.).

9. But the declarations of the Shruti equally support both views.

"This Sutra refutes the view expressed in Sutra 3. There it was shown that Janaka and others even after attaining Knowledge were engaged in work. This Sutra says the scriptural authority equally supports the view that for one who attained Knowledge there is no work. "Knowing this very Self the Brahmanas renounce the desire for sons, for wealth, and for the worlds, and lead a mendicant life" (Brih. 3.5.1.). "We also see from the scriptures that knowers of the Self like Yajnavalkya gave up work." 'This much indeed is (the means of) immortality, my dear'. Saying this Yajnavalkya left home" (Brih. 4.5.15). The work of Janaka and others was characterized by non-attachment, and as such it was practically no work; so the Mimamsa argument is weak.

10. (The declaration of the scripture referred to in Sutra 4) is not universally true.

The declaration of the Shruti that knowledge enhances the fruit of the sacrifice does not refer to all knowledge, as it is connected only with the Udgitha, which is the topic of the section.

(There is) division of knowledge and work, as in the case of a hundred (divided between two persons).

<sup>1</sup> Swami Vireswaranand, *Brahma Sutras*, 411-416.

“This Sutra refutes Sutra 5. “It is followed by knowledge, work, and past experiences” (Brih. 4.4.2.). Here we have to take knowledge and work in a distributive sense, meaning that knowledge follows one and work another. Just as when we say a hundred be given to these two persons, we divide it into two halves and give each man fifty. There is no combination of the two. Even without this explanation Sutra 5 can be refuted. For the text quoted refers only to knowledge and work, which concern the transmigrating soul, and not an emancipated soul. For the passage, “Thus does the man who desires (transmigrate)” (Brih. 4.4.6.) shows that the previous text refers to the transmigrating self. And of the emancipated soul Shruti says, “But the man who never desires (never transmigrates)” etc. (Brih. 4.4.6.).

12. (The scriptures enjoin work) only on those who have read the Vedas.

“This Sutra refutes Sutra 6. Those who have read the Vedas and known about the sacrifices are entitled to perform work. No work is prescribed for those who have knowledge of the Self from the Upanishads. Such a knowledge is incompatible with work.

13. Because there is no special mention ( of the Jaimini it does not (apply to him).

“This Sutra refutes Sutra 7. The text quoted there from the Isa Upanishad is a general statement, and there is no special mention in it that it is applicable to a Jnani also. In the absence of such a specification it is not binding on him.

14. Or rather the permission (to do work) is for praising (Knowledge).

“The injunction to do work for the knowers of the Self is for the glorification of this Knowledge. The praise involved in it is this : A knower of the Self may work all his life, but on account of this Knowledge he will not be bound by its effects.

15. And some according to their choice (have refrained from all work).

“In Sutra 3 it was said that Janaka and others were engaged in work even after Knowledge. This Sutra says that some have of their own accord given up all work. The point is that after Knowledge some may choose to work to set an example to others, while others may give up all work. There is no binding on the knowers of the Self as regards work.

16. And (the scriptures say that the) destruction (of all qualifications for work results from Knowledge).



Knowledge destroys all ignorance and its products like agent, act, and result. "But when to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self, then what should one see and through what" etc., (Brih. 4.5.15). The knowledge of the Self is antagonistic to all work and so cannot possibly be subsidiary to work.

17. And (Knowledge belongs) to those who observe continence (i.e. to Sannyasis); because (this fourth Ashrama is mentioned) in the scriptures.

"The scriptures declare that Knowledge is gained in that stage of life in which continence is prescribed, i.e. the fourth stage or Sannyasa Asrama. To a Sannyasin there is no work prescribed except discrimination. So how can Knowledge be subservient to work? That there is a stage of life called Sannyasa we find from the scriptures themselves in texts like: "There are three branches of duty; sacrifice, study and charity are the first; . . . All these attain to the worlds of the virtuous; but only one who is firmly established in Brahman attains immortality" (Chh. 2.33.1-2); "Desiring this world (the Self) alone monks renounce their homes" (Brih. 4.4.22). See also Mu. 1.2.11 and Chh. 5.10.1. Everyone can take to this life without being a householder etc. which shows the independence of Knowledge".

Many such Sutras can be found in Badarayana indicating the attitude of the two schools of thought towards each other. But one is enough as it is so very typical. If one stops to consider the matter the position becomes absolutely clear. Jaimini denounces Vedanta as a false Shastra a snare and a delusion, something superficial, unnecessary and insubstantial. What does Badarayana do in the face of this attack? He defends his own Vedanta Shastra. What one would expect from Badarayana is denunciation of the Karmakanda of Jaimini as a false religion. Badarayana shows no such courage. On the contrary he is very apologetic. He concedes that Jaimini's Karmakanda is based on the Scriptures and cannot be repudiated. All that he insists is that his Vedanta doctrine is also true because it has also the support of the Scriptures. Some explanation is necessary for this attitude of Badarayana.

## BHAGWAT GITA

The Bhagwat Gita forms part of the Bhishmaparvan of the great epic known as the Mahabharat. The epic is mainly concerned with the struggle for sovereignty between cousins, the Kauravas the sons of Dhritarashtra and the Pandavas the sons of Pandu. Pandu was the

younger brother of Dhritarashtra. But as Dhritarashtra was blind the throne went to Pandu. After Pandu's death there arises a dispute between his sons and the sons of Dhritarashtra regarding the right of succession. The struggle for sovereignty culminated in the battle of Kurukshetra (near modern Panipat). In this battle Krishna sides with the Pandavas and acts as their guide, friend and philosopher,—nay acts as the charioteer of Arjuna, one of the Pandava brothers and who plays the part of the chief warrior in the battle on the side of the Pandavas.

The two armies of the Kauravas and the Pandavas were arrayed for battle on the field. Arjuna in his chariot with Krishna as a driver comes and takes his place in front of the Pandava army. Strong and valiant he gazes at the opposing army of the Kauravas and is struck by the horror of the dreadful fratricidal war in which he will have to kill his cousins and slay those whom he himself revere and to whom he is greatly attached and indebted. He becomes dejected, lays down his weapons and refuses to fight. Krishna begins to argue with him and provoke him to fight. This argument takes the form of a question and answer of a conversation between Arjuna and Krishna at the end of which Arjuna agrees to fight.

At the opening of the Bhagwat Gita we find old Dhritarashtra questioning Sanjaya about the battle. This is because Dhritarashtra the father of the Kauravas who though alive at the time when the battle was fought was a blind man and could not see and know things for himself. For the knowledge of the happenings he had to depend upon the reports of others. Anticipating the difficulty of getting someone to tell Dhritarashtra the authentic story, Vyas the author of the Mahabharata, it is said, bestowed on Sanjaya, the charioteer of Dhritrashtra, the power of knowing all that takes place on the battlefield— even the thoughts in men's minds— that he may make a faithful report to Dhritarashtra. That is why we find the episode of Bhagwat Gita related as a reply by Sanjaya to questions by Dhritarashtra. But the Gita is really a conversation between Arjuna and Krishna and is rightly called *Krishana Arjuna Samvad*.

In this Krishna-Arjuna-Samvad—which is the real name of the Bhagwat Gita—the main question over which there was disagreement was to fight or not to fight. There was no other question. This was the one and the only question which was the subject matter of discussion and argument between the two. Starting from this point of view it is obvious that the Gita could never have been intended by Krishna to be the occasion for moral instruction for the general public or the doctrinal exposition of any religious system or the catechism attached

to any creed. Yet this is just what the Gita has come to be. Although the occasion was to decide to fight or not to fight, the Gita is said to contain what his religious doctrine Krishna is said to have preached to Arjuna.

The first question that crops up is who is this Krishna. To this one gets quite surprisingly a variety of answers from the Gita itself. At the start Krishna appears as a mere man with a completely human personality. He is a warrior by profession. He is a great warrior though he had chosen<sup>1</sup> the humble duty of driving the chariot of Arjuna. From man he grows into superman directing and controlling the war and its fortunes. From superman he grows into a demigod and dictator. When all his arguments fail to move Arjuna to fight, he simply orders him to fight and the frightened Arjuna gets up and does his biddings. From demigod he rises to the position of God and is spoken of as Ishwara.

This shows the growth of the personality of Krishna. But what is important is that in the very same Gita, Krishna stands out as a representative of other forms of God. Four such representative characters in which Krishna appears are clear to any one who happens to read the Gita even casually.

Krishna is Vasudeo :

*Bhagwat Gita:*

Ch.X.37. Of the Vrishnis I am Vasudeva; of the Pandavas, Dhananjaya; and also for the Munis, I am Vyasa; of the sages, Ushanas the sage.

Krishna as Bhagwan :

Ch.X.12. The Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Abode, the Supreme Purifier, art Thou.

Krishna is an Avtar of Vishnu :

Ch.X.21. Of the Adityas, I am Vishnu; of luminaries, the radiant Sun; of the winds, I am Marichi; of the asterisms, the Moon.

Ch.XI.24. On seeing Thee touching the sky, shining in many a colour, with mouths wide open, with large fiery eyes, I am terrified at heart, and find no courage nor peace, O Vishnu.

XI.30. Swallowing all the worlds on every side with Thy flaming mouths, Thou art licking Thy lips. Thy fierce rays, filling the whole world with radiance, are burning, O Vishnu.

Krishna is also an Avtar of Shankara :

X.23. And of the Rudras I am Shankara; of the Yakshas and Rakshasas the Lord of wealth (Kuvera); of the Vasus I am Pavaka; and of mountains, Meru am I.

<sup>1</sup> This is the result of an arrangement between him and Duryodhan leader of the Kauravas. Before the war actually started Duryodhan approached Krishna to fight on the side of the Kauravas. Krishna gave him a choice, have him or have his men the Yadavas. Duryodhan chose the Army of Yadavas. That is why Krishna and the Yadavas fought on opposite sides.

Krishna is Bramhan :—

XV.15. I am centered in the hearts of all; memory and perception as well as their loss come from Me. I am verily that which has to be known by all the Vedas, I indeed am the Author of the Vedanta, and the Knower of the Veda am I.

XV.16. There are two Purushas in the world,—The Perishable and the Imperishable. All beings are the Perishable, and the Kutastha is called Imperishable.

XV.17. But (there is) another, the Supreme Purusha, called the Highest Self, the immutable Lord, who pervading the three worlds, sustains them.

XV.18. As I transcend the Perishable and am above even the Imperishable, therefore am I in the world and in the Veda celebrated as the Purushottama, (the Highest Purusha).

XV.19. He who free from delusion thus knows Me, the Highest Spirit, he knowing all, worships Me with all his heart, O descendant of Bharata.

Ask the next question, What is the doctrine that Krishna preaches to Arjuna? The doctrine preached by Krishna to Arjuna is said to be the doctrine of salvation for the human soul. While the question dealt with by Krishna is one relating to Salvation, Krishna teaches three different doctrines of Salvation.

Salvation is possible by *Dnyanmarg* as propounded by Samkhya Yog.

II.39. The wisdom of Self-realisation has been declared unto thee. Harken thou now to the wisdom of Yoga, endued with which, O son of Pritha, thou shalt break through the bonds of Karma. Thus is the concluding verse of the discourse on Samkhya Yoga discussed in Chapter II, verses 11-16 and 18-30.

(2) Salvation is possible by *Karma* marg,

V.2. Both renunciation and performance of action lead to freedom : of these performance of action is superior to the renunciation of action.

(3) Salvation is possible by *Bhakti* Marg.

IX.13. But the great souled ones, O son of Pritha, possessed of the Divine Prakriti, knowing Me to be the origin of beings, and immutable, worship Me with a single mind.

IX.14. Glorifying Me always and striving with firm resolve, bowing down to Me in devotion, always steadfast, they worship Me.

IX.15. Others, too, sacrificing by the Yajna of knowledge (i.e. seeing the Self in all), worship Me the All Formed, as one, as distinct, as manifold.

IX.17. I am the Father of this world, the Mother, the Sustainer, the Grandfather; the Purifier, the (one) thing to be known, (the syllable) Om, and also the Rik Saman and Yajus.

IX.22. Persons who, meditating on Me as non-separate, worship Me in all beings, to them thus ever jealously engaged, I carry what they lack and preserve what they already have.

There are two other features of the Bhagwat Gita which arrests one's attention.

(i) There is a sentiment of depreciation of the Vedas and Vedic rituals and sacrifices.

II.42-44. O Partha, no set determination is formed in the minds of those that are deeply attached to pleasure and power, and whose discrimination is stolen away by the flowery words of the unwise, who are full of desires and look upon heaven as their highest goal and who, taking pleasure in the panegyric words of the Vedas, declare that there is nothing else. Their (flowery) words are exuberant with various specific rites as the means to pleasure and power and are the causes of (new) births as the result of their works (performed with desire).

II.45 The Vedas deal with the three Gunas, Be thou free, O Arjun, from the triad of the Gunas, free from the apirs of opposites, ever balanced, free from (the thought of) getting and keeping, and established in the Self.

II.46. To the Brahmana who has known the Self, all the Vedas are of so much use, as a reservoir is, when there is a flood everywhere.

IX.21. Having enjoyed the vast Swarga-world, they enter the mortal world, on the exhaustion of their merit; Thus, abiding by the injunctions of the three (Vedas), desiring desires, they (constantly) come and go.

INCOMPLETE

□ □

## CHAPTER 11

### The Triumph of Brahmanism : Regicide or the birth of Counter-Revolution

*We have found only 3 typed pages under this title. Fortunately, a copy of the essay has been spared by Shri S. S. Rege for being included in this book. While examining the pages we have noticed that the copy given by Mr. Rege also lacks page nos 3 to 7 and 9 to 17. The total typed pages of this essay have been numbered 92 inclusive of the missing pages. The title on the copy of Mr. Rege is the 'Triumph of Brahmanism'; whereas the first page of the script in our papers is also entitled as 'Regicide or the Birth of Counter-Revolution'. The classification of the subject into IX Chapters is noted in our copy whereas it is missing from the copy of Mr. Rege. Both the titles and the classification are recorded in the handwriting of Dr. Ambedkar. Hence, they are retained in this print. Incidentally, the page nos 9 to 17 were found tagged in other file. All those papers have now been introduced at proper place. Thus except page Nos. 4 to 7, the script is complete.—Editors.*

#### I

I The Brahmanic Revolt against Buddhism. II Manu the apostle of Brahmanism. III Brahmanism and the Brahmin's Right to rule and regicide. IV Brahmanism and the privileges of Brahmins. V Brahmanism and the Creation of Caste. VI Brahmanism and the degradation of the Non-Brahmins. VII Brahmanism and the Suppression of the Shudra. VIII Brahmanism and the Subjection of Women. IX Brahmanism and the legalization of the social system.

Speaking about India, Prof. Bloomfield opens his lectures on the Religion of the Veda by reminding his audience that "India is the land

of religions in more than one sense. It has produced out of its own resources, a number of distinctive systems and sects....

In another sense India is a land of religions. Nowhere else is the texture of life so much impregnated with religious convictions and practices... ”<sup>1</sup>

These observations contain profound truth. He would have given utterance to truth far more profound and arresting if he had said that India is a land of warring religions. For indeed there is no country in which Religion has played so great a part in its history as it has in the history of India. The history of India is nothing but a history of a mortal conflict between— Buddhism and Brahmanism. So neglected is this truth that no one will be found to give it his ready acceptance. Indeed there may not be wanting persons who would repudiate any such suggestion.

Let me therefore briefly recount the salient facts of Indian history. For it is important that everyone who was able to understand the history of India must know that it is nothing but the history of the struggle for supremacy between Brahmanism and Buddhism.

The history of India is said to begin with the Aryans who invaded India, made it their home and established their culture. Whatever may be the virtues of the Aryans, their culture, their religion and their social system, we know very little about their political history. Indeed notwithstanding the superiority that is claimed for the Aryans as against the Non-Aryans, the Aryans have left very little their political achievements for history to speak of. The political history of India begins with the rise of a non-Aryan people called Nagas, who were a powerful people, whom the Aryans were unable to conquer, with whom the Aryans had to make peace, and whom the Aryans were compelled to recognize as their equals. Whatever fame and glory India achieved in ancient times in the political field, the credit for it goes entirely to the Non-Aryan Nagas. It is they who made India great and glorious in the annals of the world.

The first land mark in India's political history is the emergence of the Kingdom of Magadha in Bihar in the year 642 B.C. The founder of this kingdom of Magadha is known by the name of Sisunag<sup>2</sup> and belonged to the non-Aryan race of Nagas.

From the small beginning made by Sisunag, this Kingdom of Magadha grew in its extent under the capable rulers of this Sisunag dynasty. Under Bimbisara the fifth ruler of this dynasty the kingdom

<sup>1</sup> The Religion of the Veda p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> His name is also spelt as *Sisunak*.

grew into an Empire and came to be known as the Empire of Magadha. The Sisunag dynasty continued to rule the kingdom till 413 B.C. In that year the reigning Emperor of the Sisunag Dynasty Mahananda was killed by an adventurer called Nanda. Nanda usurped the throne of Magadha and founded the Nanda Dynasty. This Nanda Dynasty ruled over the Empire of Magadha upto 322 B.C. The last Nanda king was deposed by Chandragupta who founded the Maurya Dynasty. Chandragupta was related<sup>1</sup> to the family of the last ruling emperor of the Sisunag Dynasty so that it may be said that the revolution effected by Chandragupta was really a restoration of the Naga Empire of Magadha.

The Mauryas by their conquests enormously extended the boundaries of this Empire of Magadha which they inherited. So vast became the growth of this Empire under Ashoka, the Empire began to be known by another name. It was called the Maurya Empire or the Empire of Ashoka. (*From here onwards page Nos. 4 to 7 of the MS are missing.*)

It did not remain as one of the many diverse religions then in vogue. Ashoka made it the religion of the state. This of course was the greatest blow to Brahmanism. The Brahmins lost all state patronage and were neglected to a secondary and subsidiary position in the Empire of Ashoka. Indeed it may be said to have been suppressed for the simple reason that Ashoka prohibited all animal sacrifices which constituted the very essence of Brahmanic Religion. The Brahmins had not only lost state patronage but they lost their occupation which mainly consisted in performing sacrifices for a fee which often times was very substantial and which constituted their chief source of living. The Brahmins therefore lived as the suppressed and Depressed Classes<sup>2</sup> for nearly 140 years during which the Maurya Empire lasted. A rebellion against the Buddhist state was the only way of escape left to the suffering Brahmins and there is special reason why Pushyamitra should raise the banner of revolt against the rule of the Mauryas. Pushyamitra was a Sung by Gotra. The Sungas were Samvedi Brahmins,<sup>3</sup> who believed in animal sacrifices and soma sacrifices. The Sungas were therefore quite naturally smarting under the prohibition on animal sacrifices throughout the Maurya Empire proclaimed in the very Rock Edict by Ashoka. No wonder if Pushyamitra who as a Samvedi Brahmin was the first to conceive the passion to end the degradation of the Brahmin by destroying the Buddhist state which

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hari Krishna Deb; quoted by Smith, Early History of India (1924) p.44. F.N. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The inferiority complex of the Brahmins under the Maurya Rule becomes apparent from the privileges asked for them by Manu in the Manu Smriti. This inferiority complex must be due to their depressed condition.

<sup>3</sup> See Harprasad Shastri in Buddhistic Studies (Ed. Law) Chapter XXXIV p. 819.



was the cause of it and to free them to practise their Brahmanic religion.

That the object of the Regicide by Pushyamitra was to destroy Buddhism as a state religion and to make the Brahmins the sovereign rulers of India so that with the political power of the state behind it Brahmanism may triumph over Buddhism is borne out by two other circumstances.

The first circumstance relates to the conduct of Pushyamitra himself.

There is evidence that Pushyamitra after he ascended the throne performed the Ashvamedha Yajna or the horse sacrifice, the vedic rite which could only be performed by a paramount sovereign. As Vincent Smith observes :

“The exaggerated regard for the sanctity of animal life, which was one of the most cherished features of Buddhism, and the motive of Ashoka’s most characteristic legislation, had necessarily involved the prohibition of bloody sacrifices, which are essential to certain forms of Brahmanical worship, and were believed by the orthodox to possess the highest saving efficacy. The memorable horse sacrifices of Pushyamitra marked an early stage in the Brahmanical reaction, which was fully developed five centuries later in the time of Samudragupta and his successors.”

Then there is evidence that Pushyamitra after his accession launched a violent and virulent campaign of persecution against Buddhists and Buddhism.

How pitiless was the persecution of Buddhism by Pushyamitra can be gauged from the Proclamation which he issued against the Buddhist monks. By this proclamation Pushyamitra set a price of 100 gold pieces on the head of every Buddhist monk.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Haraprasad Shastri speaking about the persecution of Buddhists under Pushyamitra says<sup>2</sup> :

“The condition of the Buddhists under the imperial sway of the Sungas, orthodox and bigotted, can be more easily imagined than described. From Chinese authorities it is known that many Buddhists still do not pronounce the name of Pushyamitra without a curse.”

## II

If the Revolution of Pushyamitra was a purely political revolution there was no need for him to have launched a campaign of persecution

<sup>1</sup> Burnouf—L'Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien (2nd.Ed.) p. 388.

<sup>2</sup> Buddhistic Studies (Ed. by Law) Chapter XXXIV p. 820.

against Buddhism which was not very different to the campaign of persecution launched by the Mahamad of Gazni against Hinduism. This is one piece of circumstantial evidence which proves that the aim of Pushyamitra was to overthrow Buddhism and establish Brahmanism in its place.

Another piece of evidence which shows that the origin and purpose of the revolution by Pushyamitra against the Mauryas was to destroy Buddhism and establish Brahmanism is evidenced by the promulgation of Manu Smriti as a code of laws.

The Manu Smriti is said to be divine in its origin. It is said to be revealed to man by Manu to whom it was revealed by the Swayambhu (i.e. the Creator). This claim, as will be seen from the reference already made to it, is set out in the Code itself. It is surprising that nobody has cared to examine the grounds of such a claim. The result is that there is a complete failure to realise the significance, place and position of the Manu Smriti in the history of India. This is true even of the historians of India although the Manu Smriti is a record of the greatest social revolution that Hindu society has undergone. There can however be no doubt that the claim made in the Manu Smriti regarding its authorship is an utter fraud and the beliefs arising out of this false claim are quite untenable.

The name Manu had a great prestige in the ancient history of India and it is with the object to invest the code with this ancient prestige that its authorship was attributed to Manu. That this was a fraud to deceive people is beyond question. The code itself is signed<sup>1</sup> in the family name of Bhrigu as was the ancient custom. "The Text Composed by Bhrigu (entitled) "The Dharma Code of Manu" is the real title of the work. The name Bhrigu is subscribed to the end of every chapter of the Code itself. We have therefore the family name of the author of the Code. His personal name is not disclosed in the Book. All the same it was known to many. The Author of Narada Smriti writing in about the 4th Century A.D. knew the name of the author of the Manu Smriti and gives out the secret. According to Narada it was one Sumati Bhargava who composed the Code of Manu. Sumati Bhargava is not a legendary name, and must have been historical person for even Medhatithi<sup>2</sup> the great commentator on the Code of Manu held the view that this Manu was 'a certain individual'. Manu therefore is the assumed name of Sumati Bhargava who is the real author of Manu Smriti.

<sup>1</sup> On this point see Jaiswal's Volume on Manu & Yajnavalkya.

<sup>2</sup> Commentary on Manu I.I.

When did this Sumati Bhargava compose this Code? It is not possible to give any precise date for its composition. But quite a precise period during which it was composed can be given. According to scholars whose authority cannot be questioned Sumati Bhargava must have composed the Code which he deliberately called *Munu Smriti* between 170 B.C. and 150 B.C. Now if one bears in mind the fact that the Brahmanic Revolution by Pushyamitra took place in 185 B.C. there remains no doubt that the code known as *Manu Smriti* was promulgated by Pushyamitra as embodying the principles of Brahmanic Revolution against the Buddhist state of the Mauryas. That the *Manu Smriti* forms the Institutes of Brahmanism and are a proof that Pushyamitra Revolution was not a purely personal adventure will be clear to any one who cares to note the following peculiarities relating to the *Manu Smriti*.

First thing to be noted is that the *Manu Smriti* is a new Code of law promulgated for the first time during the reign of Pushyamitra. There was a view once prevalent that there existed a code known as the *Manava-Dharma-Sutra* and that what is known as *Manu Smriti* is an adaptation of the old *Manava Dharma Sutra*. This view has been abandoned as there has been no trace of any such work. Two other works existed prior to the present *Manu Smriti*. One was known as *Manava Artha Sastra*, or *Manava-Raja-Sastra* or *Manava-Raja-Dharma-Sastra*. The other work was known as *Manava-Grihya-Sutra*. Scholars have compared the *Manu Smriti*. On important points the provisions of one are not only dissimilar but are in every way contrary to the provisions contained in the other. This is enough to show that *Manu Smriti* contains the new law of the new regime.

That the new regime of Pushyamitra was anti-Buddhist is betrayed by the open provisions enacted in the *Manu Smriti* against the Buddhists and Buddhism. Note the following provisions in *Manu Smriti* :—

IX. 225. “.... Men who abide in heresy ... the king should banish from his realm.”

IX. 226. “These robbers in disguise, living in the king’s realm constantly injure the worthy subject by the performance of their misdeeds.”

V. 89. “Libations of water shall not be offered to (the souls of) those who (neglect the prescribed rites and may be said to) have been born in vain, to those born in consequence of an illegal mixture of the castes, to those who are ascetics (of heretical sects) and to those who have committed suicide.”

V.90. (Libations of water shall not be offered to the souls of) women who have joined a heretical sect....

IV. 30. Let him (the householder) not honour, even by a greeting heretics.... logicians, (arguing against the Veda).

XII. 95. "All those traditions and all those despicable systems of Philosophy, which are not based on the Veda produce no reward after death, for they are declared to be founded on Darkness.

XII. 96. "All those (doctrines), differing from the (Veda), which spring up and (soon) perish, are worthless and false, because of modern date."

Who are the heretics to whom Manu refers and whom he wants the new king to banish from his realm and the Householder not to honour in life as well as after death? What is this worthless philosophy of modern date, differing from the Vedas, based on darkness and bound to perish? There can be no doubt that the heretic of Manu is the Buddhist and the worthless philosophy of modern date differing from the Vedas is Buddhism. Kalluck Bhutt another commentator on Manu Smriti expressly states that the references to heretics in these Shlokas in Manu are to the Buddhists and Buddhism.

The third circumstance is the position assigned to the Brahmins in the Manu Smriti. Note the following provisions in Manu :—

I. 93. As the Brahmana sprang from (Bramha's) mouth, as he was the first born, and as he possesses the Veda, he is by right the lord of this whole creation.

I. 96. Of created beings the most excellent are said to be those which are animated; of the animated, those which subsist by intelligence; of the intelligent, mankind; and of men, the Brahmins.

I. 100. Whatever exists in the world is the property of the Brahmins; on account of the excellence of his origin the Brahmana is, indeed, entitled to it all.

I. 101. The Brahmana eats but his own food, wears but his own apparel, bestows but his own in alms; other mortals subsist through the benevolence of the Brahmana.

X. 3. On account of his pre-eminence, on account of the superiority of his origin, on account of his observance of (particular) restrictive rules, and on account of his particular sanctification, the Brahmana is the lord of (all) castes.

XI. 35. The Brahmana is declared to be the creator of the world, the punisher, the teacher, and hence a benefactor of all created beings; to him let no man say anything unpropitious, nor use any harsh words.

Manu warns the King against displeasing the Bramhans in the following terms :—

IX. 313. Let him (the King) not, though fallen unto the deepest distress, provoke Bramhans to anger; for they, when angered, could instantly destroy him together with his army and his vehicles. Manu further proclaims,

XI. 31. A Bramhana who knows the law need not bring any (offence) to the notice of the king; by his own power alone he can punish those men who injure him.

XI. 32. His own power is greater than the power of the king; The Bramhana, therefore, may punish his foes by his own power alone.

This deification of the Brahmins, placing them even above the King would have been impossible unless the King himself was a Brahmin and in sympathy with the view expressed by Manu. Pushyamitra and his successors could not have tolerated these exaggerated claims of the Brahmins unless they themselves were Brahmins interested in the establishment of Bramhanism. Indeed it is quite possible that the Manu Smriti was composed at the command of Pushyamitra himself and forms the book of the philosophy of Bramhanism.

Taking all these facts into considerations there can remain no doubt; the one and only object of Pushyamitra's revolution was to destroy Buddhism and re-establish Bramhanism.

The foregoing summary of the political history of India would have been quite unnecessary for the immediate purpose of this chapter if I was satisfied with the way in which the history of India is written. But frankly I am not satisfied. For too much emphasis is laid on the Muslim conquest of India. Reels and reels have been written to show how wave after wave of Muslim invasions came down like avalanche and enveloped the people and overthrew their rulers. The whole history of India is made to appear as though the only important thing in it is a catalogue of Muslim invasions. But even from this narrow point of view it is clear that the Muslim invasions are not the only invasions worth study. There have been other invasions equally if not of greater importance. If Hindu India was invaded by the Muslim invaders so was Buddhist India invaded by Bramhanic invaders. The Muslim invasions of Hindu India and the Bramhanic invasions of Buddhist India have many similarities. The Musalman invaders of Hindu India fought among themselves for their dynastic ambitions. The Arabs, Turks, Mongols and Afghans fought for supremacy among themselves. But they had one thing in common—namely the mission to destroy idolatry. Similarly the Bramhanic invaders of Buddhist India fought

among themselves for their dynastic ambitions. The Sungas, Kanvas and the Andhras fought for supremacy among themselves. But they, like the Muslim invaders of Hindu India, had one object in common that was to destroy Buddhism and the Buddhist Empire of the Mauryas. Surely if Muslim invasions of Hindu India are worthy of study at the hands of the historians, the invasions of Buddhist India by Bramhanic invaders are equally deserving of study. The ways and methods employed by the Bramhanic invaders of Buddhist India to suppress Buddhism were not less violent and less virulent than the ways and means adopted by Muslim invaders to suppress Hinduism. From the point of view of the permanent effect on the social and spiritual life of the people, the Bramhanic invasions of Buddhist India have been so profound in their effect that compared to them, the effect of Muslim invasions on Hindu India have been really superficial and ephemeral. The Muslim invaders destroyed only the outward symbols of Hindu religion such as temples and Maths etc. They did not extirpate Hinduism nor did they cause any subversion of the principles or doctrines which governed the spiritual life of the people. The effects of the Bramhanic invasions were a thorough-going change in the principles which Buddhism had preached for a century as true and eternal principles of spiritual life and which had been accepted and followed by the masses as the way of life. To alter the metaphor the Muslim invaders only stirred the waters in the bath and that too only for a while. Thereafter they got tired of stirring and left the waters with the sediments to settle. They never threw the baby—if one can speak of the principles of Hinduism as a baby—out of the bath. Bramhanism in its conflict with Buddhism made a clean sweep. It emptied the bath with the Buddhist Baby in it and filled the bath with its own waters and placed in it its own baby. Bramhanism did not care to stop how filthy and dirty was its water as compared with the clean and fragrant water which flowed from the noble source of Buddhism. Bramhanism did not care to stop how hideous and ugly was its own baby as compared with the Buddhist baby. Bramhanism acquired by its invasions political power to annihilate Buddhism and it did annihilate Buddhism. Islam did not supplant Hinduism. Islam never made a thorough job of its mission. Bramhanism did. It drove out Buddhism as a religion and occupied its place.

These facts show that Brahmanic invasions of Buddhist India have a far greater significance to the Historian of India than the Muslim invasions of Hindu India can be said to have produced. Yet very little space is devoted by historians to the vicissitudes which befell Buddhist India built up by the Mauryas and even where that is done they have

not cared to deal in a pointed manner with questions that quite naturally arise: questions such as, who were the Sungas, Kanavas and Andhras; why did they destroy the Buddhist India which was built up by the Mauryas, nor has any attempt been made to study the changes that Brahmanism after its triumph over Buddhism brought about in the political and social structure.

Failure to appreciate this aspect of India's history is due to the prevalence of some very wrong notions. It has been commonly supposed that the culture of India has been one and the same all throughout history; that Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism are simply different phases and that there has never been any fundamental antagonism between them. Secondly it has been assumed that whatever conflicts have taken place in Indian politics were purely political and dynastic and that they had no social and spiritual significance. It is because of these wrong notions that Indian history has become a purely mechanical thing, a record of one dynasty succeeding another and one ruler succeeding another ruler. A corrective to such an attitude and to such a method of writing history lies in recognition of two facts which are indisputable.

In the first place it must be recognized that there has never been such as a common Indian culture, that historically there have been three Indias, Brahmanic India, Buddhist India and Hindu India, each with its own culture. Secondly it must be recognized that the history of India before the Muslim invasions is the history of a mortal conflict between Brahmanism and Buddhism. Any one who does not recognize these two facts will never be able to write a true history of India, a history which will disclose the meaning and purpose running through it. It is a corrective to Indian history written as it is and to disclose the meaning and purposes running through it that I was obliged to re-cast the history of the Brahmanic invasions of Buddhist India and the political triumph of Brahmanism over Buddhism.

We must therefore begin with the recognition of the fact: Pushyamitra's revolution was a political revolution engineered by the Brahmins to overthrow Buddhism.

The curious will naturally ask what did this triumphant Brahmanism do? It is to this question that I will now turn. The deeds or misdeeds of this triumphant Brahmanism may be catalogued under seven heads. (1) It established the right of the Brahmin to rule and commit regicide. (2) It made the Brahmins a class of privileged persons. (3) It converted the Varna into caste. (4) It brought about a conflict and anti-social feeling between the different castes. (5) It degraded the Shudras and the women (6) It forged the system of graded inequality and (7) It made legal and rigid the social system which was conventional and flexible.

To begin with the first.

The revolution brought about by Pushyamitra created an initial difficulty in the way of the Brahmins. People could not be easily reconciled to this revolution. The resentment of the public was well expressed by the poet Bana<sup>1</sup> when in referring to this revolution reviles Pushyamitra as being base born and calls his act of regicide as *Anarya*. The act of Pushyamitra was properly described by Bana as *Anarya* i.e. contrary to Aryan law. For on three points the Aryan law at the date of Pushyamitra's revolution was well settled. The then Aryan law declared (1) That Kingship is the right of the Kshatriya only. A Brahmin could never be a king. (2) That no Brahmin shall take to the profession of Arms<sup>2</sup> and (3) That rebellion against the King's authority was a sin. Pushyamitra in fostering the rebellion had committed a crime against each of these three laws. He was Brahmin, and although a Brahmin he rebelled against the King, took to the profession of Arms and became a King. People were not reconciled to this usurpation which constituted so flagrant a breach of the law that the Brahmins had to regularize the position created by Pushyamitra. This the Brahmins did by taking the bold step of changing the law. This change of law is quite manifest from the Manu Smriti. I will quote the appropriate shlokas from the Code:

XII. 100. "The post of the Commander-in-Chief of the Kingdom, the very Headship of Government, the complete empire over every one are deserved by the Brahmin."

Here we have one change in the law. This new law declares that the Brahmin has a right to become Senapati (Commander of forces), to conquer a kingdom, and to be the ruler and the Emperor of it.

XI. 31. A Brahmin, who well knows the laws, need not complain to the king of any grievous injury; since, even by his own power, he may chastise those, who injure him.

XI. 32. His (Brahmin's) own power, which depends on himself alone is mightier than the royal power, which depends on other men; by his own might, therefore may a Brahmin coerce his foes.

<sup>1</sup> Harsha Charita, quoted by Smith (1924) p. 208.

<sup>2</sup> The rule was so strict that according to the Apastamba Dharmasutra 'A Brahman shall not take up a weapon in his hand though he be only desirous of examining it.' It may be matter of some surprize how Pushyamitra who was a Brahmin could have done a deed which could under the circumstances be expected only from a member of the martial race. This difficulty is well explained by Harprasad Shastri. According to him the Sungas though Brahmins were a martial race. Among the fighting Brahmins, two were distinguished among the rest, the Vishwamitras and the Bharadvajas. The wife of Vishwamitra Brahmin proving barren, a Bharadvaj was requested by the ancient custom of 'Niyoga' to beget a son on Vishwamitra's. The issue was Sung. He was the progenitor of a Gotra and that Gotra took up the Samveda for their study. The Sungas were called a Dvayamushyam gotra i.e. a gotra issuing from the two gotras, Vishwamitra and Bharadvaj both of which had taken to military occupation—See Buddhistic Studies (Ed. by Law) Ch. XXXIV, p. 820.



XI. 261-62. A Brahmin who has killed even the peoples of the three worlds, is completely freed from all sins on reciting three times the Rig, Yajur or Sama.-Veda with the Upanishadas."

Here is the second change in the law. It authorized the Brahmin to kill not only the king but to engage in a general massacre of men if they seek to do injury to his power and position.

VIII. 348. "The twice born man may take arms, when the rightful occupation assigned to each by Dharma is obstructed by force; and when, in some evil time, a disaster has befallen the twice-born classes."

IX. 320. Of a Kshatriya (Military man or king), who raise his arm violently on all occasions against the Brahmins, Brahmin himself shall be the chastiser; since the soldier originally proceeded from the Brahmin."

This is the third legal change. It recognized the right to rebellion and the right to regicide. The new law is very delicately framed. It gives the right of rebellion to three higher classes. But it is also given to the Brahmins singly by way of providing for a situation when the Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas may not be prepared to join the Brahmin in bringing about a rebellion. The right of rebellion is well circumscribed. It can be exercised only when the king is guilty of upsetting the occupations assigned by Manu to the different Varnas.

These legal changes were as necessary as they were revolutionary. Their object was to legalize and regularize the position created by Pushyamitra by killing the last Maurya King. By virtue of these legal changes, a Brahmin could lawfully become a king, could lawfully take arms, could lawfully depose or murder a king who was opposed to Chaturvarna and could lawfully kill any subject that opposed the authority of the Brahmin. Manu gave the Brahmins a right to commit Bartholomeu if it became necessary to safeguard their interests.

In this way Brahmanism established the right of Brahmana to rule and set at rest whatever doubt and dispute there was regarding the same. But that could hardly be enough for the Brahmins as a whole. It may be a matter of pride but not of any advantage. There can be no special virtue in Brahmin rule if the Brahmin was treated as common man along with the Non-Brahmins having the same rights and same duties. Brahmin rule if it is to justify itself, it must do so by conferring special privileges and immunities on the Brahmins as a class. Indeed Pushyamitra's Revolution would have been an ill wind blowing no good if it had not recognized the superior position of the Brahmins and conferred upon them special advantages. Manu was alive to this and accordingly proceeds to create monopolies for Brahmins and grant them certain immunities and privileges as may be seen from the Code.

First as to monopolies:

I. 88. To Brahmanas he assigned teaching and studying (the Veda) sacrificing for their own benefit and for others, giving and accepting (of alms).

X. 1. Let the three twice-born castes (Varna), discharging their (prescribed) duties, study (the Veda); but among them the Brahmana (alone) shall teach it, not the other two; that is an established rule.

X. 2. The Brahmana must know the means of subsistence (prescribed) by law for all, instruct others, and himself live according to (the law).

X. 3. On account of his pre-eminence, on account of the superiority of his origin, on account of his observance of (particular) restrictive rules, and on account of his particular sanctification, the Brahmana is the lord of (all) castes (varna).

X. 74. Brahmanas who are intent on the means (of gaining union with) Brahman and firm in (discharging) their duties, shall live by duly performing the following six acts, (which are enumerated) in their (proper) order.

X. 75. Teaching, studying, sacrificing for himself, sacrificing for others, making gifts and receiving them are the six acts (prescribed) for a Brahmana.

X. 76. But among the six acts (ordained) for him three are his means of subsistence, (viz.) sacrificing for others, teaching, and accepting gifts from pure men.

X. 77. (Passing) from the Brahmana to the Kshatriya, three acts (incumbent) (on the former) are forbidden, (viz.) teaching, sacrificing for others, and, thirdly, the acceptance of gifts.

X. 78. The same are likewise forbidden to a Vaisya, that is a settled rule; for Manu, the lord of creatures (Prajapati), has not prescribed them for (men of) those two (castes).

X. 79. To carry arms for striking and for throwing (is prescribed) for Kshatriyas as a means of subsistence; to trade, (to rear) cattle, and agriculture for Vaisyas; but their duties are liberality, the study of the Veda, and the performance of sacrifices.

Here are three things which Manu made the monopoly of the Brahmin: teaching Vedas, performing Sacrifices and receiving gifts.

The following are the immunities that were granted to the Brahmins. They fall into two classes; freedom from taxation and exemption from certain forms of punishment for crimes.

VII. 133. Though dying (with want), a king must not levy a tax on Srotriyas, and no Srotriya residing in his kingdom, must perish from hunger.

VIII. 122. They declare that the wise have prescribed these fines for perjury, in order to prevent a failure of justice, and in order to restrain injustice.

VIII. 123. But a just king shall fine and banish (men of) the three (lower) castes (varna) who have given false evidence, but a Brahmana he shall (only) banish.

VIII. 124. Manu, the son of the Self-existent (Svayambhu), has named ten places on which punishment may be (made to fall) in the cases of the three (lower) castes (varna); but a Brahmana shall depart unhurt (from the country).

VIII. 379. Tonsure (of the head) is ordained for a Brahmana (instead of) capital punishment; but (men of) other castes shall suffer capital punishment.

VIII. 380. Let him never slay a Brahmana, though he have committed all (possible) crimes; let him banish such an (offender), leaving all his property (to him) and (his body) unhurt.

Thus Manu places the Brahmin above the ordinary penal law for felony. He is to be allowed to leave the country withdraw a wound on him and with all property in proved offences of capital punishment. He is not to suffer forfeiture of fine nor capital punishment. He suffered only banishment which in the words of Hobbes was only a "Change of air" after having committed the most heinous crimes.

Manu gave him also certain privileges.

A Judge must be a Brahmin.

VIII. 9. But if the king does not personally investigate the suits, then let him appoint a learned Brahmana to try them.

VIII. 10. That (man) shall enter that most excellent court, accompanied by three assessors, and fully consider (all) causes (brought) before the (king), either sitting down or standing.

The other privileges were financial

VIII. 37. When a learned Brahmana has found treasure, deposited in former (times), he may take even the whole (of it); for he is master of everything.

VIII. 38. When the king finds treasure of old concealed in the ground, let him give one half to Brahmanas and place the (other) half in his treasury.

IX. 323. But (a king who feels his end drawing nigh) shall bestow all his wealth, accumulated from fines, on Brahmanas, make over his kingdom to his son, and then seek death in battle.

IX. 187. Always to that (relative within three degrees) who is nearest to the (deceased) Sapinda the estate shall belong; afterwards a Sakulya shall be (the heir, then) the spiritual teacher or the pupil.

IX. 188. But on failure of all (heirs) Brahmanas (shall) share the estate, (who are) versed in the three Vedas, pure and self-controlled; thus the law is not violated.

IX. 189. The property of a Brahmana must never be taken by the King, that is a settled rule; but (the property of men) of other castes the king may take on failure of all (heirs).

These are some of the advantages, immunities and privileges which Manu conferred upon the Brahmins. This was a token of a Brahmin having become a king.

Supporters of Brahmanism—so strong is the belief in the excellence of Brahmanism that there are no apologists for it as yet—never fail to point to the disabilities which Manu has imposed upon the Brahmins. Their object in doing so is to show that the ideal placed by Manu before the Brahmin is poverty and service. That Manu has placed certain disabilities upon the Brahmins is a fact. But to conclude from it that Manu's ideal for a Brahmin is poverty and service is a gross and deliberate concoction for which there is no foundation in Manu.

To understand the real purpose which Manu had in imposing these disabilities, two things must be borne in mind. Firstly the place Manu has assigned to the Brahmins in the general scheme of society and secondly the nature of the disabilities. The place assigned by Manu to the Brahmins is enunciated by him in unequivocal terms. The matter being important I must quote again the Verses already quoted.

I. 93. As the Brahmana sprang from (Brahman's) mouth, as he was the first born, and as he possesses the Veda, he is by right the lord of this whole creation.

Consider the nature of the disabilities.

IV. 2. A Brahmana must seek a means of subsistence which either causes no, or at least little pain (to others), and live (by that) except in times of distress.

IV. 3. For the purpose of gaining bare subsistence, let him accumulate property by (following those) irreproachable occupations (which are prescribed for) his (caste), without (unduly) fatiguing his body.

VIII. 337. In (a case of) theft the guilt of a Sudra shall be eightfold, that of a Vaishya sixteenfold, that of a Kshatriya two-and-thirty fold.

VIII. 338. That of a Brahmana sixty-four-fold, or quite a hundred-fold or (even) twice four-and-sixty-fold; (each of them) knowing the nature of the offence.

VIII. 383. A Brahmana shall be compelled to pay a fine of one thousand (panas) if he has intercourse with guarded (females of)

those two (castes); for (offending with) a (guarded) Sudra female a fine of one thousand (panas) (shall be inflicted) on a Kshatriya or a Vaishya.

VIII. 384. For (intercourse with) an unguarded Kshatriya a fine of five hundred (panas shall fall) on a Vaisya; but (for the same offence) a Kshatriya shall be shaved with the urine (of a donkey) or (pay) the same fine.

VIII. 385. A Brahmana who approaches unguarded females (of the) Kshatriya or Vaisya (castes), or a Sudra female, shall be fined five hundred (panas); but (for intercourse with) a female (of the) lowest (castes), one thousand.

Examining these disabilities against the background furnished by the place assigned to him by Manu, it is obvious that the object of these disabilities was not to make the Brahmin suffer. On the other hand it becomes clear that the object of Manu was to save the Brahmin from falling from the high pinnacle on which he had placed him and incurring the disgrace of the non-Brahmins.

That the object of Manu was not to subject the Brahmins to poverty and destitute is clear from other provisions from Manu-Smriti. In this connection reference should be made to the rule contained in the Manu Smriti regarding the course of conduct a Brahmin should pursue when he is in distress.

X. 80. Among the several occupations the most commendable are, teaching the Veda for a Brahmana, protecting (the people) for a Kshatriya, and trade for a Vaisya.

X. 81. But a Brahmana, unable to subsist by his peculiar occupations just mentioned, may live according to the law applicable to Kshatriyas; for the latter is next to him in rank.

X. 82. If it be asked, 'How shall it be, if he cannot maintain himself by either (of these occupations?)' the answer is), he may adopt a Vaisya's mode of life, employing himself in agriculture and rearing cattle.

X. 83. But a Brahmana, or a Kshatriya, living by a Vaisya's mode of subsistence, shall carefully avoid (the pursuit of) agriculture, (which causes) injury to many beings and depends on others.

X. 84. (Some) declare that agriculture is something excellent, (but) that means of subsistence is blamed by the virtuous; (for) the wooden (implement) with iron point injures the earth and (the beings) living in the earth.

X. 85. But he who, through a want of means of subsistence, gives up the strictness with respect to his duties, may sell, in order to

increase his wealth, the commodities sold by Vaisyas, making (however) the (following) exceptions.

It will be seen that the disabilities imposed upon a Brahmin last as long as he is prospering by the occupations which belong to him as of right. As soon as he is in distress and his disabilities vanish and he is free to do anything that he likes to do in addition to the occupations reserved to him and without ceasing to be a Brahmin. Further whether he is in distress or not is a matter which is left to the Brahmin to be decided in his own discretion. There is therefore no bar to prevent even a prosperous Brahmin to supplement his earnings by following any of the professions open to him in distress by satisfying his conscience.

There are other provisions in Manu Smriti intended to materially benefit the Brahmanas. They are *Dakshina* and *Dana*. *Dakshina* is the fee which the Brahmin is entitled to charge when he is called to perform a religious ceremony. Brahmanism is full of rites and ceremonies. It is not very difficult to imagine how great must this source of income be to every Brahmin. There was no chance of a priest being cheated of his fees. The religious sense attached to *Dakshina* was a sufficient sanction for regular payment. But Manu wanted to give the Brahmins the right to recover his fees.

XI. 38. A Brahmana who, though wealthy, does not give, as fee for the performance of an Agnyadheya, a horse sacred to Prajapati, becomes (equal to one) who has not kindled the sacred fires.

XI. 39. Let him who has faith and controls his senses, perform other meritorious acts, but let him on no account offer sacrifices at which he gives smaller fees (than those prescribed).

XI. 40. The organs (of sense and action), honour, (bliss in) heaven, longevity, fame, offspring, and cattle are destroyed by a sacrifice at which (too) small sacrificial fees are given; hence a man of small means should not offer a (Srauta) sacrifice.

He even goes to the length of excusing a Brahmin by declaring that anything done by him to recover his fees shall not be an offence under the law.

VIII. 349. In their own defence, in a strife for the fees of officiating priests and in order to protect women and Brahmanas; he who (under such circumstances kills in the cause of right, commits no sin.

But it is the provision of *Dana* which makes a fruitful source of income to the Brahmins. Manu exhorts the King to make *Dana* to Brahmins.

VII. 79. A King shall offer various (Srauta) sacrifices at which liberal fees (are distributed), and in order to acquire merit, he shall give to Brahmanas enjoyments and wealth.

VII. 82. Let him honour those Brahmanas who have returned from their teacher's house (after studying the Veda); for that (money which is given) to Brahmanas is declared to be an imperishable treasure for kings.

VII. 83. Neither thieves nor foes can take it, nor can it be lost; hence an imperishable store must be deposited by kings with Brahmanas.

XI. 4. But a king shall bestow, as is proper, jewels of all sorts, and presents for the sake of sacrifices on Brahmanas learned in the Vedas.

This admonition by Manu to the King did not remain a mere hope for the Brahmin. For as history shows that this exhortation was fully exploited by the Brahmins as the number of *dana patras* discovered by Archialogists indicate. It is astounding how the kings were befooled by the Brahmins to transfer village after village to crafty, lazy and indolent Brahmins. Indeed a large part of the wealth of the present day Brahmins lies in this swindle practised by wily Brahmins upon pious but foolish kings. Manu was not content to let the Brahmin prey upon the King for *dana*. He also allowed the Brahmin to prey upon the public in the matter of *dana*. This Manu does in three different ways. In the first place he exhorts people to make gifts as a part of the duty owed by the pious to himself at the same time pointing out that the highest *dana* to a Brahmin.:

VII. 85. A gift to one who is not a Brahmana (yields) the ordinary (reward); a gift to one who calls himself a Brahmana, a double (reward); a gift to a well-read Brahmana, a hundred thousandfold (reward); (a gift) to one who knows the Veda and the Angas (Vedaparanga), (a reward) without end.

VII. 86. For according to the particular qualities of the recipient and according to the faith (of the giver) a small or a great reward will be obtained for a gift in the next world.

In the next place Manu declares that in certain circumstances *dana* to a Brahmin is compulsory.

XI. 1. Him who wishes (to marry for the sake of having) offspring, him who wishes to perform a sacrifice, a traveller, him who has given away all his property, him who begs for the sake of his teacher, his father, or his mother, a student of the Veda, and a sick man.

XI. 2 These nine Brahmanas one should consider as Snatakas, begging in order to fulfill the sacred law; to such poor men gifts must be given in proportion to their learning.

XI. 3. To these most excellent among the twice-born, food and presents (of money) must be given; it is declared that food must be given to others outside the sacrificial enclosure.

XI. 6. One should give, according to one's ability, wealth to Brahmanas learned in the Veda and living alone; (thus) one obtains after death heavenly bliss.

The third method adopted by Manu to make the rule of Dana become a source of secure and steady income is beyond question the most ingenuous one. Manu linked up *dana* with penance. In the Scheme of Manu, an improper act may be a sin although not an offence or it may be both a sin as well as an offence. As a sin its punishment is a matter for canonical law. As an offence its punishment is a matter of secular law. As sin, the improper act is called Pataka and the punishment for it is called Penance. In the Scheme of Manu every Pataka must be expunged by the performance of a penance.

XI. 44. A man who omits a prescribed act, or performs a blameable act, or cleaves to sensual enjoyments, must perform a penance.

XI. 45. (All) sages prescribe a penance for a sin unintentionally committed; some declare, on the evidence of the revealed texts, (that it may be performed) even for an intentional (offences).

XI. 46. A sin unintentionally committed is expiated by the recitation of Vedic texts, but that which (men) in their folly commit intentionally, by various (special) penances.

XI. 53. Thus in consequence of a remnant of (the guilt of former) crimes, are born idiots, dumb, blind, deaf and deformed men, who are (all) despised by the virtuous.

XI. 54. Penances, therefore, must always be performed for the sake of purification, because those whose sins have not been expiated, are born (again) with disgraceful marks.

The penances prescribed by Manu are many and the curious may refer to the Manu Smriti itself for a knowledge of what they are. What is worthy of note is these penances are calculated to materially benefit the Brahmin. Some penances take the form of a simple *dana* to the Brahmin. Others prescribe the performance of some religious rites. But as religious rites cannot be performed by anybody except by a Brahmin and that the performance of religious rite requires the payment of fees the Brahmin alone can be the beneficiary of the *dana* system.



It is therefore absurd to suggest that Manu wanted to place before the Brahmins the ideal of humility, poverty and service. The Brahmins certainly did not understand Manu that way. Indeed they believed that they were made a privileged class. Not only they believed in it but they sought to extend their privileges in other directions a matter which will be discussed later on. They were perfectly justified, in their view. Manu called the Brahmins the 'lords of the earth' and he framed (the law) with such care that they shall remain so.

Having made full provision for Brahmin Rule and Brahmin dominance Manu next launches out to transform society to suit his purposes.

The transformation of Varna into Caste is the most stupendous and selfish task in which Brahmanism after its triumph became primarily engaged. We have no explicit record of the steps that Brahmanism took to bring about this change. On the contrary we have a lot of confused thinking on the relation between Varna and Caste. Some think that Varna and Caste are the same. Those who think that they are different seem to believe that Varna became caste when prohibition on intermarriage became part of the social order. All this, of course, is erroneous and the error is due to the fact that Manu in transforming the Varna into Caste has nowhere explained his ends and how his means are related to those ends. Oscar Wilde has said that to be intelligible is to be found out. Manu did not wish to be found out. He is therefore silent about his ends and means, leaving people to imagine them. For Hindus the subject is important beyond measure. An attempt at clarification is absolutely essential so that the confusion due to different people imagining differently the design of Manu may be removed and light thrown on the way how Brahmanism proceeded to give a wrong and pernicious turn to the original idea of Varna as the basis of society.

As I said Manu's ways are silent and subterranean and we cannot give the detailed and chronological history of this conversion of Varna into Caste. But fortunately there are landmarks which are clear enough to indicate how the change was brought about.

Before proceeding to describe how this change was brought about let me clear the confusion between Varna and Caste. This can best be done by noting the similarities and differences between the two. Varna and Caste are identical in their *de jure* connotation. Both connote status and occupation. Status and occupation are the two concepts which are implied both in the notion Varna as well as in the notion of Caste. Varna and Caste however differ in one

• important particular. Varna is not hereditary either in status or occupation. On the other hand Caste implies a system in which status and occupation are hereditary and descend from father to son.

When I say that Brahmanism converted Varna into Caste what I mean is that it made status and occupation hereditary.

How was this transformation effected? As I said there are no foot prints left of the steps taken by Brahmanism to accomplish this change but there are landmarks which serve to give us a clear view of how the deed came to be done.

The change was accomplished by stages. In the transformation of Varna into Caste three stages are quite well marked. The first stage was the stage in which the duration of Varna i.e. of status and occupation of a person was for a prescribed period of time only. The second stage was a stage in which the status and occupation involved the Varna of a person ensured during lifetime only. The third stage was a stage in which the status and occupation of the Varna became hereditary. To use legal language the Estate conferred by Varna was at the beginning an Estate for a term only. Thereafter it became a life Estate and finally it became an Estate of inheritance which is tantamount to saying that Varna became Caste. That these are the stages by which Varna was converted into Caste seems to have ample support from tradition as recorded in the religious literature.<sup>1</sup> There is no reason why this tradition should not be accepted as embodying some thing that is quite genuine. According to this tradition, the task of determining Varna of a person was effected by a body of officers called Manu and Sapta Rishis. From the mass of people Manu selected those who were fit to be Kshatriyas and Vaishas and the Sapta Rishis selected those who were fit to be Brahmanas. After this selection was made by Manu and Sapta Rishis for being Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishas, the rest that were not selected were called Shudras. The Varna arrangement so determined lasts for one *Yug* i.e. a period of four years. Every fourth year a new body of officers known by the same designation Manu and Sapta Rishi were appointed for making a new selection. It happened that last time some of those who were left to be fit only for being Shudras were selected for being Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas while some of those who were, elected last time for being Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas were left as being fit only of being Shudras. Thus the personnel of the Varna changed. It was

<sup>1</sup> I am here following the clues supplied by the investigations of Mr. Daphtary and Pradnayneshwar Yati. The former's *Dharma Rahasya* and the latter's *Chaturvarnya* are very valuable as they are quite original in their point of view. The subject of course needs to be further investigated along the lines suggested by them.

a sort of a periodical shuffling and selection of men to take up according to their mental and physical aptitudes and occupations which were essential to the life of the community. The time when the reshuffling of the Varnas took place was called *Manwantar* which etymologically means change of Varna made by Manu. The word *Manwantar* also means the period for which the Varna of an individual was fixed. The word *Manwantar* is very rich in its contents and expresses the essential elements of the Varna system which were two. First it shows that Varna was determined by an independent body of people called Manu and Saptarshi. Secondly it shows that the Varna was for a period after which a change was made by Manu<sup>1</sup>. According to ancient tradition as embodied in the Puranas the period for which the Varna of a person was fixed by Manu and Saptarshi was a period of four years and was called *Yug*. At the end of the period of four years there occurred the *Manwantar* whereby every fourth year the list was revised. Under the revision some changed their old Varna, some retained it, some lost it and some gained it.<sup>2</sup>

The original system seems to have in contemplation the determination of the Varna of adults. It was not based on prior training or close scrutiny of bias and aptitude. Manu and Saptarshi was a sort of a Board of Interview which determined the Varna of a person from how he struck them at the interview. The determination of the Varna was done in a rough and tumble manner. This system seems to have gone into abeyance. A new system grew up in its place. It was known as the Gurukul system. The Gurukul was a school maintained by a Guru (teacher) also called Acharya (learned man). All children went to this Gurukul for their education. The period of education extended for twelve years. The child while at Gurukul was known as *Bramhachari*. After the period of education was over there was the *Upanayan* ceremony performed at the Gurukul by the Acharya. The *Upanayan* ceremony was the most important ceremony. It was a ceremony at which the Acharya determined the Varna of the student and sent him out in the world to perform the duties of that Varna. *Upanayan* by the Acharyas was the new method of determining Varna which came into vogue in place of method of determination by Manu and Saptarshi. The new method was undoubtedly superior to the old method. It retained the

<sup>1</sup> One can now see why Sumati Bhargava called his code as the Code of Manu. He wanted to invest it with the dignity and authority of the ancient law-giver Manu.

<sup>2</sup> This is the only theory which can explain how some of the Mantras of the Vedas are admitted to have been made by Shudras, a question which in view of the statement of Manu that the Shudras must not recite the Vedas, nor hear them recited becomes a very puzzling question.

true feature of the old method namely that the Varna should be determined by a disinterested and independent body. But it added a new feature namely training as a pre-requisite for assignment of Varna. On the ground that training alone develops individual in the make up of a person and the only safe way to determine the Varna of a person is to know his individuality, the addition of this new feature was undoubtedly a great improvement.

With the introduction of the Acharya Gurukul system, the duration of the Varna came to be altered. Varna instead of being Varna for a period became Varna for life. But it was not hereditary.

Evidently Brahmanism was dissatisfied with this system. The reason for dissatisfaction was quite obvious. Under the system as prevalent there was every chance of the Acharya declaring the child of a Brahmin as fit only to be a Shudra. Brahmanism was naturally most anxious to avoid this result. It wanted the Varna to be hereditary. Only by making the Varna hereditary could it save the children of the Brahmins from being declared Shudra. To achieve this Brahmanism proceeded in the most audacious manner one can think of.

### III

Brahmanism made three most radical changes in the system of determining the Varna of the child. In the first place the system of Gurukul as the place where training to the child was given and its Varna was determined by the Guru at the end of the period of training was abolished. Manu is quite aware of the Gurukul and refers to *Guruvas*<sup>1</sup> i.e. training and residence in the Gurukul under the Guru. But does not refer to it at all in connection with the Upanayan. He abolishes the Guru as an authority competent to perform Upanayan by omitting to make even the remotest reference to him in connection with Upanayan. In place of the Guru Manu allows the Upanayan of the child to be performed by its father at home.<sup>2</sup> Secondly Upanayan was made into a Sanskara i.e. a sacrament. In olden times Upanayan was like a convocation ceremony<sup>3</sup> held by the Guru to confer degrees obtained by students in his Gurukul in which certificates of proficiency in the duties of a particular Varna were granted. In Manu's law that Upanayan was a complete change in the meaning and purpose of this most important institution. Thirdly the relation of training to Upanayan was totally reversed. In the olden system training came before Upanayan.

<sup>1</sup> Manu II. 67 Where Manu.

<sup>2</sup> Manu II, 36-37.

<sup>3</sup> On this point see Pradnaneshwar Yati's booklet on Upanayan.

Under the Brahmanism Upanayan came before training. Manu directs that a child be sent to the Guru for training but that is after Upanayan i.e. after<sup>1</sup> his Varna is determined by his father.

The principal change made by Brahmanism was the transfer of authority from the Guru to the father in the matter of performing Upanayan. The result was that the father having the right to perform the Upanayan of his child gave his own Varna to the child and thus made it hereditary. It is by divesting the Guru of his authority to determine the Varna and vesting it in the father that Brahmanism ultimately converted Varna into Caste.

Such is the story of the transformation of Varna into Caste. The story of the transition from one to the other is of course reconstructed. For the reasons already given it may not be quite as accurate as one would wish it to be in all its details. But I have no doubt that the stages and the ways by which Varna ceased to exist and caste came into being must be some such as have been suggested in the foregoing discussion of the subject.

What object Brahmanism could have had in converting Varna into caste it is not difficult to imagine. The object was to make the high status enjoyed by the Brahmins from ancient times the privilege of every Brahmin and his progeny without reference to merits or to qualifications. To put it differently the object was to elevate and ennoble every Brahmin, however mean and worthless he may be, to the high status occupied by some of them on account of the virtue. It was an attempt to ennoble the whole of the Brahmin Community without exception.

That this was the object of Brahmanism is clear from Manu's ordinances. Manu knew that making Varna hereditary, the most ignorant Brahmin<sup>2</sup> will be elevated to the status occupied by the most learned Brahmin. He feared that the former may not be respected as much as the most learned, which was the object of this attempt at the ennoblement of the whole class of Brahmins. Manu is very much concerned about the ignorant Brahmin—a new thing—and warns people against being disrespectful to an ignorant and mean Brahmin.

IX. 317. A Brahmin, whether learned or ignorant, is a powerful divinity; even as fire is powerful divinity, whether consecrated or popular.

IX. 319. Thus although Brahmins employ themselves in all sorts of mean occupations, they must invariably be honoured; for they are something transcendently divine.

<sup>1</sup> Manu II. 69.

<sup>2</sup> Under the Varna there could be no ignorant Brahmin. The possibility of an ignorant Brahmin can arise only when Varna becomes Caste i.e. when one becomes a Brahmin only by reason of birth.

Such a warning was unnecessary if the object was to ennoble the whole Brahmin class. Here is a case where vice refuses to pay to virtue even the homage of hypocrisy. Can there be greater moral degeneracy than what is shown by Manu in insisting upon the worship of the Brahmin even if he is mean and ignorant?

So much for the object of change from Varna to caste. What have been the consequences of this change?

From the spiritual point of view the consequences have been too harmful to be contemplated with equanimity. The harm done may perhaps be better realized by comparing the position of the Brahmin as a priest resulting from the law of Manu with that of the law of the clergy under the Church of England. There the clergy is subject to the criminal law as every citizen is. But in addition to that he is always subject to Church Discipline Act. Under the Criminal Law he would be punished if he officiated as a clergy without being qualified for it. Under the Church Discipline Act he would be liable to be disqualified as a clergy for conduct which would be deemed to be morally wrong although it did not amount to a crime. This double check on the clergy is held justifiable because learning and morality are deemed to be quite essential for the profession of the clergy who are supposed to administer to the spiritual needs of the people. Under Brahmanism the Brahmin who alone can be the clergy need not possess learning or morality. Yet he is in sole charge of the spiritual affairs of the people!! On the value of a creed which permits this, comment is unnecessary.

From the secular point of view, the consequences of this transformation of Varna into Caste has to introduce a most pernicious mentality among the Hindus. It is to disregard merit and have regard only to birth. If one is descended from the high he has respect although he may be utterly devoid of merit or worth. One who is of high birth will be superior to the one who is of low birth although the latter may be superior to the former in point of worth. Under Brahmanism it is birth that always wins, whether it is against birth or against worth. Merit by itself can win no meads. This is entirely due to the dissociation of merits from status which is the work of Brahmanism. Nothing could be better calculated to produce an unprogressive society which sacrifices the rights of intelligence on the altar of aristocratic privilege.


Now the third deed in the catalogue of deeds done by Brahmanism after its triumph over Buddhism. It was to separate the Brahmins from the rest of the Non-Brahmin population and to sever the different social strata of the Non-Brahmin population.

Pushyamitra's Brahmanic Revolution was undertaken for the purposes of restoring the ancient social system of Chaturvarna which under the Buddhist regime was put into the melting pot. But when Brahmanism triumphed over Buddhism it did not content itself with merely restoring Charutvarna as it was in its original form. The system of Chaturvarna of the Pre-Buddhist days was a flexible system and was an open to system. This was because the Varna system had no connection with the marriage system. While Chaturvarna recognized the existence of four different classes, it did not prohibit inter-marriage between them. A male of one Varna could lawfully marry a female of another Varna. There are numerous illustrations in support of this view. I give below some instances which refer to well known and respectable individuals which have acquired a name and fame in the sacred lore of the Hindus.

Husband	His Varna	Wife	Her Varna
1. Shantanu	Kshatriya	Ganga	Shudra Anamik
2. Shantanu	Kshatriya	Matsyagandha	Shudra Fisher woman
3. Parashara	Brahmin	Matsyagandha	Shudra Fisher woman
4. Vishwamitra	Kshatriya	Menaka	Apsara
5. Yayati	Kshatriya	Devayani	Brahmin
6. Yayati	Kshatriya	Sharmishta	Asuri—Non-Aryan
7. Jaratkaru	Brahmin	Jaratkari	Nag—Non-Aryan

Should anybody retain doubt on the question that the division of the society into classes did not prohibit intermarriages between the four Varnas let him consider the geneology of the family of the great Brahmin sage Vyas.

### GENEOLOGY OF VYAS



Brahminism with the ferocity of an outraged brute, proceeded to put a stop to these intermarriage between the different Varnas. A new law is proclaimed by Manu. It is in the following terms:--

III. 12. For the first marriage of twice born men (wives) of equal caste are recommended.

III. 13. It is declared that a Sudra woman alone can be the wife of a Shudra.

III. 14. A Shudra woman is not mentioned even in any (ancient) story as the (first) wife of a Brahmana or of a Kshatriya, though they lived in the (greatest) distress.

III. 15. Twice-born men who, in their folly, wed wives of the low (Sudra) caste, soon degrade their families and their children to the state of Sudras.

III. 16. According to Atri and to (Gautama) the son of Utathya, he who weds a Sudra woman becomes an outcast, according to Saunaka on the birth of a son, and according to Bhrigu he who has (male) offspring from a (Sudra female, alone).

III. 17. A Brahmana who takes a Sudra wife to his bed, will (after death) sink into hell; if he begets a child by her, he will lose the rank of a Brahmana.

III. 18. The manes and the gods will not eat the (offerings) of that man who performs the rites in honour of the gods, of the manes, and of guests chiefly with a (Sudra wife's) assistance, and such (a man) will not go to heaven.

III. 19. For him who drinks the moisture of a Sudra's lips, who is tainted by her breath, and who begets a son on her, no expiation is prescribed.

Brahmanism was not satisfied with the prohibition of intermarriage. Brahmanism went further and prohibited interdining.

Manu lays down certain interdicts on food. Some are hygienic. Some are social. Of the social the following are worthy of attention:

IV. 218. Food given by a king, impairs his manly vigour; by one of the servile class, his divine light; by goldsmiths, his life; by leathercutters, his good name.

IV. 219. Given by cooks and the like mean artizans, it destroys his offsprings: by a washerman, his muscular strength;

IV. 221. That of all others, mentioned in order, whose food must never be tasted, is held equal by the wise to the skin, bones, and hair of the head.

IV. 222. Having unknowingly swallowed the food of any such persons, he must fast during three days; but having eaten it knowingly, he must perform the same harsh penance, as if he had tasted any seminal impurity, ordure, or urine.

I said that Brahmanism acted with the ferocity of an outranged brute in undertaking the task of prohibiting intermarriage and interdining. Those who have doubts in this matter ponder over the language of Manu.



Mark the disgust Manu shows with regard to the Shudra woman.

Mark what Manu says about the food of the Shudra. He says it is as impure as semen or urine.

These two laws have produced the caste system. Prohibition of intermarriage and prohibition against interdining are two pillars on which it rests. The caste system and the rules relating to intermarriage and interdining are related to each other as ends to means. Indeed by no other means could the end be realized.

The forging of these means shows that the creation of the caste system was end and aim of Brahmanism. Brahmanism enacted the prohibitions against intermarriage and interdining. But Brahmanism introduced other changes in the social system and if the purposes underlying these changes are those which I suggest them to be, then it must be admitted that Brahmanism was so keen in sustaining the caste system that it did not mind whether ways and means employed were fair or unfair, moral or immoral. I refer to the laws contained in the Code of Manu regarding marriage of girls and the life of widows.

See the law that Manu promulgates regarding the marriage of females.

IX. 4. Reprehensible is the father who gives not (his daughter) in marriage at the proper time.

IX. 88. To a distinguished, handsome suitor of equal caste should a father give his daughter in accordance with the prescribed rule, though she have not attained (the proper age), i.e. although she may not have reached puberty.

By this rule Manu enjoins that a girl should be married even though she may not have reached the age of puberty i.e. even when she is a child.

Now with regard to widows Manu promulgates the following rule.

V. 157. At her pleasure let her (i.e. widow) emaciate her body, by living voluntarily on pure flowers, roots and fruits; but let her not, when her lord is deceased, even pronounce the name of another man.

V. 161. But a widow, who from a wish to bear children, slights her deceased husband by marrying again, brings disgrace on herself here below, and shall be excluded from the seat of her lord (in heaven).

V. 162. Offspring begotten on a woman by any other than her husband, is here declared to be no progeny of hers; no more than a child, begotten on the wife of another man belongs to the begetter; nor is a second husband any where prescribed for a virtuous woman.

This is the rule of enforced widowhood for a woman. A reference may also be made to Sati or a widow who burns herself on the funeral pyre of her husband and thus puts an end to her life. Manu is silent about it.

Yajnavalkya<sup>1</sup> an authority nearly as great as Manu says, she must not live separately or alone.

86. When deprived of her husband, she must not remain away from her father, mother, son, brother, mother-in-law or from her maternal uncle; otherwise she might become liable to censure.

Here again Yajnavalkya does not suggest that a widow become a Sati. But Vijnaneshwar, the author of Mitakshara a commentary on Yajnavalkya Smriti makes the following observation in commenting on the above Sloka.

“This is in the case of the alternative of leading a celibate life vide the text of Vishnu<sup>2</sup>: “After the death of the husband, either celibacy or ascending the (cremation) pile after him.”

Vijnaneshwar<sup>3</sup> adds as his opinion that ‘There is great merit in ascending the funeral pyre after him.’

From this one can very easily and clearly see how the rule of Sati came to be forged. Manu’s rule was that a widow was not to remarry. But it appears from the statement by Vijnaneshwar that from the time of the Vishnu Smriti a different interpretation began to put on the ordinance of Manu. According to this new interpretation Manu’s rule was explained to be offering to the widow a choice between two alternatives: (1) Either burn yourself on your husband’s funeral pyre or (2) If you don’t, remain unmarried. This of course is totally false interpretation quite unwarranted by the clear words of Manu. Somehow it came to be accepted. The date of the Vishnu Smriti is somewhere about the 3rd or 4th Century. It can therefore be said that rule of Sati dates from this period.

One thing is certain, these were new rules. The rule of Manu that girl should be married before she has reached puberty is a new rule. In Pre-Buddhistic Brahmanism<sup>4</sup> marriages were performed not only after puberty but they were performed when girls had reached an age when they could be called grown up. Of this there is ample evidence. Similarly the rule that a woman once she had lost her husband must not remarry is a new rule. In the Pre-Buddhist Brahmanism there was no prohibition on widow remarriage. The fact that the Sanskrit language contains words such as *Punarbhū* (woman who has

<sup>1</sup> The date of the Yajnavalkya Smriti is between 150-200 A.D.

<sup>2</sup> Vishnu Smriti Ch. XXV 14.

<sup>3</sup> He wrote his Mitakshara between 1070 and 1100 A.D.

<sup>4</sup> See Kane—History of Dharmashastra I. Part I. page.

undergone a second marriage ceremony) and *punarbhav* (second husband) show that such marriages were quite common under the Pre-Buddhist Brahmanism.<sup>1</sup> With regard to Sati the position as to when it arose,<sup>2</sup> there is evidence to suggest that it existed in ancient times. But there is evidence that it had died out and it was revived after Brahmanism under Pushyamitra obtained its victory over Buddhism although it was some time later than Manu.

Question is this, why these changes were made by the triumphant Brahmanism? What did Brahmanism want to achieve by having girls married before they had become pubert, by denying the widow to the right to marry again and by telling her to put herself to death by immolating herself in the funeral pyre of her deceased husband? No explanations are forthcoming for these changes. Mr. C. V. Vaidya who offers an explanation for girl marriage says<sup>3</sup> that girl marriage was introduced to prevent girls from joining the Buddhist order of nuns. This explanation does not satisfy me. Mr. Vaidya omits to take into consideration another rule laid down by Manu—namely the rule relating to suitable age for marriage. According to that rule.

IX. 94. A man, aged thirty, shall marry a maiden of twelve who pleases him, or a man of twenty-four a girl eight years of age.

The question is not why girl marriage was introduced. The question is why Manu allowed so much discrepancy in the ages of the bride and the bridegroom.

Mr. Kane<sup>4</sup> has attempted an explanation of Sati. His explanation is that there is nothing new in it. It existed in India in ancient times as it did in other parts of the world. This again does not satisfy the world. If it existed outside India, it has not been practised on so enormous a scale as in India. Secondly if traces of it are found in Ancient India in the Kshatriyas, why was it revived, why was it not universalized? There is no satisfactory explanation. Mr. Kane's explanation that the prevalence of Sati by reference to laws of inheritance does not appear to me very convincing. It may be that because under the Hindu Law of inheritance as it prevailed in Bengal, women got a share in property. The relations of the husband of the widow pressed her to be a Sati in order to get rid of a share may explain why Sati was practised on so large a scale in Bengal. But it does not explain how it arose nor how it came to be practised in other parts of India.

Again with regard to the prohibition of widow remarriage, there is no explanation whatsoever. Why was the widow, contrary to

<sup>1</sup> See Kane—History of Dharmashastra, Vol. II, Part II Chapt.

<sup>2</sup> The available evidence on Sati has been collected by Kane in his History of Dharmashastra Vol. II Part I pp. 617-636.

<sup>3</sup> History of India Vol. II.

<sup>4</sup> History of Dharmashastra.

established practice, prohibited from marrying? Why was she required to lead a life of misery? Why was she disfigured?

My explanation for girl marriage, enforced widowhood and Sati is quite different and I offer it for what it is worth.<sup>1</sup>

“Thus the superposition of endogamy over exogamy means the creation of Caste. But this is not an easy affair. Let us take an imaginary group that desire to make itself into a caste and analyse what means it will have to adopt to make itself endogamous. If a group desires to make itself endogamous, a formal injunction against intermarriage with outside groups will be of no avail, especially if prior to the introduction of endogamy, exogamy were to be the rule in all matrimonial relations. Again there is a tendency in all groups living in close contact with one another to assimilate and amalgamate, and thus consolidate into a homogeneous society. If this tendency be strongly counteracted in the interest of Caste formation, it is absolutely necessary to circumscribe a circle without which people should not contract marriages.”

“Nevertheless this encircling to prevent marriages from without creates problems from within which are not very easy of solution. Roughly speaking in a normal group the two sexes are more or less evenly distributed, and generally speaking there is an equality between those of the same age. But this equality is never quite realised in actual societies. While to the group that is desirous of making itself into a caste the maintenance of this equality between the sexes becomes the ultimate goal, for without this endogamy can no longer subsist. In other words, if endogamy is to be preserved, conjugal rights from within have to be provided for, else members of the group will be driven out of the circle to take care of themselves in any way they please. But in order that the conjugal rights be provided for from within, it is absolutely necessary to maintain a numerical equality between the marriageable units of the two sexes within the group desirous of making itself into a Caste. It is only through the maintenance of this equality that the necessary endogamy of the group could be kept intact, and a very large disparity is sure to break it.”

“The problem of Caste then ultimately resolves itself into one of repairing the disparity between the marriageable units of the two sexes within it. The much needed parity between the units could be realized only when a couple dies simultaneously. But this is a rare contingency. The husband may die before the wife and create a surplus woman who must be disposed of, else through intermarriage she will violate the endogamy of the group. In like manner the husband may survive his

<sup>1</sup> They will be found in my paper on “Castes in India” which appeared in *The Indian Antiquary* for May, 1917.

wife and be a surplus man whom the group, while it may sympathise with him for the sad bereavement, has to dispose of, else he will marry outside the Caste and will break the endogamy. Thus both the surplus man and the surplus woman constitute a menace to the Caste if not taken care of, for, not finding suitable partners inside their prescribed circle (and they cannot find any, for there are just enough pairs to go round) very likely they will transgress the boundary, marry outside and import population that is foreign to the Caste. Let us see what our imaginary group is likely to do with this surplus man and surplus woman. We will first take up the case of the surplus woman. She can be disposed of in two different ways so as to preserve the endogamy of the Caste."

"First : burn her on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband and get rid of her. This, however, is rather an impracticable way of solving the problem of sex disparity. In some cases it may work, in others it may not. Consequently every surplus woman cannot thus be disposed of, because it is an easy solution but a hard realization. However, the surplus woman (widow) if not disposed of, remains in the group: but in her very existence lies a double danger. She may marry outside the Caste and violate to endogamy or she may marry within the Caste and through competition encroach upon the chances of marriage that must be reserved for the potential brides in the Caste. She therefore is a menace in any case and something must be done to her if she cannot be burned along with her deceased husband."

"The second remedy is to enforce widowhood on her for the rest of her life. So far as the objective results are concerned burning is a better solution than enforcing widowhood. Burning the widow eliminates all the three evils that a surplus woman is fraught with. Being dead and gone she creates no problem of remarriage either inside or outside the Caste. But compulsory widowhood is superior to burning because it is more practicable. Besides being comparatively humane it also guards against the evils of remarriage as does burning; but it fails to guard the morals of the group. No doubt under compulsory widowhood the woman remains and, just because she is deprived of her natural right of being a legitimate wife in future, the incentive to bad moral conduct is increased. But this is by no means an insuperable difficulty. She can be degraded to a condition where she could no longer be a source of allurements."

"The problem of surplus man (—widower) is much more important and much more difficult than that of the surplus woman in a group that desires to make itself into a Caste. From time immemorial man as compared with woman has had the upper hand. He is a dominant

figure in every group and of the two sexes has greater prestige. With this traditional superiority of man over woman his wishes have always been consulted. Woman on the other hand has been an easy prey to all kinds of iniquitous injunctions, religious, social or economic. But man as a maker of injunctions is most often above them all. Such being the case you cannot accord the same kind of treatment to a surplus man as you can to a surplus woman in a Caste."

"The project of burning him with his deceased wife is hazardous in two ways: first of all it cannot be done, simply because he is a man. Secondly, if done, a sturdy soul is lost to the Caste. There remain then only two solutions which can conveniently dispose of him. I say conveniently because he is an asset to the group."

"Important as he is to the group, endogamy is still more important, and the solution must assure both these ends. Under these circumstances he may be forced, or I should say induced, after the manner of the widow to remain a widower for the rest of his life. This solution is not altogether difficult, for without there being any compulsion some are so disposed as to enjoy self-imposed celibacy or may even take a further step of their own accord to renounce the world and its joys. But, given human nature as it is, this solution can hardly be expected to be realized. On the other hand, as is very likely to be the case, if he remains in the group as an active participator in group activities, he is a danger to the morals of the group. Looked at from a different view point, celibacy though easy in cases where it succeeds, is not so advantageous even then to the material prospects of the Caste. If he observes genuine celibacy and renounces the world, he would not be a menace to the preservation of Caste endogamy or Caste morals as undoubtedly would be, if he remained a secular person. But as an ascetic celibate he is as good as burned, so far as the material well-being of his Caste is concerned. A Caste, in order that it may be large enough to afford a vigorous communal life, must be maintained at a certain numerical strength. But to hope for this and to proclaim celibacy is the same as trying to cure atrophy by bleeding.

"Imposing celibacy on the surplus man in the group therefore fails, both theoretically and practically. It is in the interest of the Caste to keep him as a Grahastha (one who raises a family) to use a Sanskrit technicality. But the problem is to provide him with a wife from within the Caste. At the outset this is not possible, for the ruling ratio in a caste has to be one man to one woman and none can have two chances of marriage, for in a Caste thoroughly self enclosed there are always just enough marriageable women to go round for the marriageable men. Under these circumstances the surplus man can

only be provided with a wife by recruiting a bride from the ranks of those not yet marriageable in order to tie him down to the group. This is certainly the best of the possible solutions in the case of the surplus man. By this, he is kept within the Caste. By this, this numerical depletion through constant outflow is guarded against, and by this endogamy and morals are preserved.

“It will now be seen that the four means by which numerical disparity between the two sexes is conveniently maintained are : (1) Burning the widow with her deceased husband ; (2) Compulsory widowhood—a milder form of burning ; (3) Imposing celibacy on the widower ; (4) Wedding him to a girl not yet marriageable. Though as I said above, burning the widow and imposing celibacy on the widower are of doubtful service to the group in its endeavour to preserve its endogamy, all of them operate as means. But means as forces, when liberated or set in motion create an end. What then is the end that these means create? They create and perpetuate endogamy, while caste and endogamy, according to our analysis of the various definitions of caste, are one and the same thing. Thus the existence of these means means caste and caste involves these means.”

“This, in my opinion, is the general mechanism of a caste in a system of castes. Let us now turn to the castes in the Hindu Society and inquire into their mechanism. I need hardly promise that there are a great many pitfalls in the path of those who try to unfold the past, and caste in India to be sure is a very ancient institution. This is especially true where there exist no authentic or written history or records or where the people, like the Hindus are so constituted that to them writing history is a folly, for the world is an illusion. But institutions do live, though for a long time they may remain unrecorded and as often as not customs and morals are like fossils that tell their own history. If this is true, our task will be amply rewarded if we scrutinize the solution the Hindus arrived at to meet the problems of the surplus man and surplus woman.”

“Complex though it be in its general working the Hindu Society, even to a superficial observer, presents three singular uxorial customs, namely:—

(i) Sati or the burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her deceased husband.

(ii) Enforced widowhood by which a widow is not allowed to remarry.

(iii) Girl marriage.

In addition to these, one also notes a great hankering after Sannyasa (renunciation) on the part of the widower, but it may in some cases be due purely to psychic disposition.

“So far as I know, no scientific explanation of the origin of these customs is forth coming even today. We have plenty of philosophy to tell us why these customs were honoured. (Cf. A. K. Coomaraswamy— “Sati : a Defence of the Eastern Woman” in the British Sociological Review Vol. VI 1913) Because it is a “proof of the perfect unity of body and soul” between husband and wife and of “devotion beyond the grave”, because it embodied the ideal of wifehood which is well expressed by Uma when she said “Devotion to her Lord is woman’s honour, it is her eternal heaven: and O Maheshwara”, she adds with a most touching human cry, “I desire not paradise itself if thou art not satisfied with me!” Why compulsory widowhood is honoured I know not nor have I yet met with anyone who sang in praise of it, though there are a great many who adhere to it. The eulogy in honour of girl marriage is reported by Dr. Ketkar to be as follows : “A really faithful man or woman ought not to feel affection for a woman or a man other than the one with whom he or she is united. Such purity is compulsory not only after marriage, but even before marriage, for that is the only correct ideal of chastity. No maiden could be considered pure if she feels love for a man other than to whom she might get married. As she does not know whom she is going to get married to, she must not feel affection for any man at all before marriage. If she does so, it is a sin. So it is better for a girl to know whom she has to love, before any sexual consciousness has been awakened in her”. Hence girl marriage.

“This high-flown and ingenious sophistry indicates why these institutions were honoured, but does not tell us why they were practised. My own interpretation is that they were honoured because they were practised. Any one slightly acquainted with rise of individualism in the 18th century will appreciate my remark. At all times, it is the movement that is most important; and the philosophies grow around it long afterwards to justify it and give it a moral support. In like manner I urge that the very fact that these customs were so highly eulogized proves that they needed eulogy for their prevalence. Regarding the question as to why they arose, I submit that they were needed to create the structure of caste and the philosophies in honour of them were intended to popularize them or to gild the pill, as we might say, for they must have been so abominable and shocking to the sense of the unsophisticated that they needed a great deal of sweetening. These customs are essentially of the nature of means, though they are represented as ideals. But this should not blind us from understanding the results that flow from them. One might safely say that idealization of means is



necessary and in this particular case was perhaps motivated to endow them with greater efficacy. Calling means an end does not harm except that it disguises its real character, but it does not deprive it of its real nature, that of a means. You may pass a law that all cats are dogs, just as you can call a means an end. But you can no more change the nature of means thereby than you can turn cats into dogs; consequently I am justified in holding that, regard them as ends or as means, Sati, enforced widowhood and girl marriage are customs that were primarily intended to solve the problem of the surplus man and surplus woman in a caste and to maintain its endogamy. Strict endogamy could not be preserved without these customs, while caste without endogamy is fake."

According to my view girl marriage, enforced widowhood and Sati had no other purpose than that of supporting the Caste System which Brahmanism was seeking to establish by prohibiting intermarriage. It is difficult to stop intermarriage. Members of different castes are likely to go out of their Caste either for love or for necessity. It is to provide against necessity that Brahmanism made these rules. This is my explanation of these new rules, made by Brahmanism. That explanation may not be acceptable to all. But there can be no doubt that Brahmanism was taking all means possible to prevent intermarriages between the different classes taking place.

Another illustration of this desire on the part of Brahmanism is to be found in the rule regarding excommunication promulgated by Manu.

Manu says that a person who is excommunicated by his Caste is an outcast.<sup>1</sup> According to Manu an outcast is to be treated as though he was actually dead. Manu ordains that his obsequies should be performed and lays down the mode and manner of performing these obsequies of the outcast.

XI. 183. The Sapindas and Samanodakas of an outcast must offer (a libation of) water (to him, as if he were dead), outside (the village), on an inauspicious day, in the evening and in the presence of the relatives, officiating priests, and teachers.

XI. 184. A female slave shall upset with her foot a pot filled with water, as if it were for a dead person; (his Sapindas) as well as the Samanodakas shall be impure for a day and a night.

Manu however allows the outcast to return to Caste on performing penance as will be seen from the following rules:

XI. 187. But when he has performed his penance, they shall bathe with him in a holy pool and throw down a new pot, filled with water.

<sup>1</sup> The outcast is quite different from an Untouchable as will be shown later.

XI. 188. But he shall throw that pot into water, enter his house and perform, as before, all the duties incumbent on a relative.

XI. 189. Let him follow the same rule in the case of female outcasts; but clothes, food, and drink shall be given to them, and they shall live close to the (family-) house.

But if the outcast was recalcitrant and impenitent Manu provides for his punishment.

Manu will not allow the outcast to live in the family house. Manu enjoins that

XI. 189. ....Clothes, food, and drink shall be given to them (i.e. the outcast members of the family), and they shall live close to the (family) house.

III. 92. Let him (i.e. the householder) gently place on the ground (some food) for dogs, outcasts, chandals, those afflicted with diseases that are punishments of former sins, crows and insects.

Manu declares that having social intercourse with an outcast is a sin. He warns the Snataka

IV. 79. ....not (to) stay together with outcasts.

IV. 213. ....Not (to eat food given) by outcasts.

To the householder Manu says:—

III. 151. Let him (i.e. the householder) not entertain at a Shradha.

III. 157. (A person) who forsakes his mother, his father, or a teacher without (sufficient) reason, he who has contracted an alliance with outcasts either through the Veda or through a marriage.

Manu ordains a social boycott of the outcast by penalizing those who associate with him.

XI. 181. He who associates himself for one year with an outcast himself becomes an outcast; not by sacrificing, reading the Veda, or contracting affinity with him, since by those acts he loses his class immediately, but even by using the same carriage or seat, or by taking his food at the same board.

XI. 182. He who associates with any one of those outcasts, must perform, in order to atone for (such) intercourse, the penance prescribed for that (sinner).

Then there are penalties against an outcast who defies his caste and chooses to remain an outcast. Manu tells him what will be his penalty in the next world.

XII. 60. He who has associated with outcasts (will) become Brahmarakshas (i.e. an evil spirit).

Manu however was not prepared to leave the outcast with this. He proceeds to enact penalty the severity of which cannot be doubted. The following are the penal sections of Manu Smriti against an outcast.

III. 150. . . . . Those Brahmins who are . . . . . outcasts . . . . . Athesists are unworthy (to partake) of oblations to the gods and manes.

IX. 201. . . . . Outcast receive(s) no share (in inheritance).

XI. 185. But thenceforward (i.e. after the obsequies of the outcast have been performed) it shall be forbidden to converse with him, to sit with him, to give him a share of the inheritance, and to hold with him such intercourse as is usual among men;

XI. 186. And (if the outcast be the eldest) his right of primogeniture shall be withheld and the additional share, due to the eldest son; and in his stead a younger brother, excelling in virtue (i.e. who observes the rule of caste) shall obtain the share of the eldest.

Such is the law of Manu against an outcast. The severity of the penalties prescribed against him is quite obvious. Its effect is to exclude him from all social intercourse, to suspend him from every civil function, to disqualify him for all offices and to disable him from inheriting any property. Under these pains and penalties the outcaste might as well be dead which indeed Manu considers him to be, directing libations to be offered to the manes as though he was naturally so. This system of privations and mortifications was enforced by prescribing a similar fate to anyone who endeavoured to associate with an outcast. The penalty was not confined to the outcast. Nor was it restricted to males. Males and females were both subject to the law of the outcast. Even their progeny was subject to penalty. The law was extended to the son of the outcast. Born before

son was entitled to inherit immediately, as though his father was dead. Born after excommunication he lost his right to inherit, i.e. he became an outcast along with his father.

The laws of Manu regarding the outcast are of course devoid of justice and humanity. Some might think that there is nothing very strange about them. That is because these laws are very similar to the laws against apostacy and heresy to be found in all religious codes. It is unfortunately a fact. All religions — *Except Buddhism* — have used or misused the laws of inheritance for enforcing adhesion and conformity to their codes. The conversion of a Christian to Judaism or paganism or any other religion was punished by the Emperors Constantines and Jul'

Emperors Theodosius and Valentinianus added capital punishment, in

case the apostle endeavoured to pervert others to the same inequity. This was borrowed by all the European countries<sup>1</sup> who maintained a similar system of penalties to enforce the Christian faith.

Such a view of the law of the outcast would be quite superficial. First of all the outcast is a creation of Brahmanism. It is a necessary coefficient of caste. Indeed once Brahmanism was determined to create the caste system the law against the outcast was absolutely essential. For only by punishing the outcast can the caste system be maintained. Secondly there is a difference between the Christian or Mahomedan Law of Apostacy and the Brahmanic law of caste. The disqualification under the Christian or Mahomedan law of apostacy was restricted to want of religious belief or the profession of wrong religious belief. Under the Brahmanic law the disqualification had no connection with belief or want of belief. It was connected with the sanctity of a certain form of social organization—namely Caste. It is the act of going out of one's caste that was made punishable. This is a very important difference.

The Brahmanic law of the outcast as compared with the law of apostacy in other religions shows that a belief in God is not essential to Brahmanism; that a belief in life after death is not essential to Brahmanism; that a belief in salvation either by good deeds or by a belief in a prophet is not essential to Brahmanism; that a belief in the sacredness of the Vedas is essential to Brahmanism. This is only one thing that is essential to Brahmanism. For it is only breach of caste which is penalized. All else is left to violation.

Those who are not blind to these forces of integration will admit that this act of Brahmanism in prohibiting intermarriage and interdining is nothing short of a complete dismemberment of society. It is a deathknell to unity, an effective bar to united action. As will be shown hereafter Brahmanism was keen on preventing united action by Non-Brahmins to overthrow Brahmanism and that is why Brahmanism brought about this segmentation of Indian Society. But the fatal effects of a poison can never be confined to the limits of the original intention of the perpetrator. The same thing has happened in the case of Caste. Brahmanism intended to paralyse the Non-Brahmans for action against Brahmins. it did not design that they as a nation should be paralysed for action against a foreign nation. But the result of the poison of Caste has been they have become stricken for action against Brahmanism as well as against foreigners. In other words Brahmanism in instituting Caste system has put the greatest impediment against the growth of nationalism.

<sup>1</sup> See Stephen's Commentaries on the Laws of England (15th Ed.) Vo. IV. p. 179.

In spite of what others say the Hindu will not admit that there is any thing evil in the Caste system., and from one point of view he is right. There is love, unity and mutual aid among members of a family. There is honour among thieves. A band of robbers have common interests as respects to its members. Gangs are marked by fraternal feelings and intense loyalty to their own ends however opposed they may be to the other gangs. Following this up one can say that a Caste has got all the praiseworthy characteristics which a society is supposed to have.

It has got the virtues of a family inasmuch as there is love unity and mutual aid. It has got the honour known to prevail among thieves. It has got the loyalty and fraternal feeling we meet with in gangs and it also possesses that sense of common interests which is found among robbers.

A Hindu may take satisfaction in these praiseworthy characteristics of the Caste and deny that there is anything evil in it. But he forgets that his thesis that Caste is an ideal form of social organization is supportable on the supposition that each caste is entitled to regard himself as an independent society, as an end in itself as nations do. But the theory breaks down when the consideration pertains to Hindu Society and to the Caste-System which goes with it.

Even in such a consideration of the subject the Hindu will not admit that the Caste system is an evil. Charge Hinduism with the responsibility for the evils of the Caste-system and the Hindu will at once retort, "What about the Class System in Europe?" Upto a point the retort is good if it means that there exists nowhere that ideal society of the philosophers marked by organic unity, accompanied by praiseworthy community of purpose, mutuality of sympathy, loyalty to public ends and concern for general welfare. Nobody can have much quarrel if the Hindu by way of analogy were to say that in every Society there are families and classes marked by exclusiveness, suspicion, and jealousy as to those without; bands of robbers, gangs, narrow cliques, trade unions, Employees' Associations, Kartels, Chambers of Commerce and political parties. Some of these are held together by the interest and plunder and others while aspiring to serve the public do not hesitate to prey upon it.

It may be conceded that everywhere *de facto* society whether in the past or in the present is not a single whole but a collection of small groups devoted to diverse purposes as their immediate and particular objectives. But the Hindu cannot take shelter under this analogy between the Hindu caste system and the Non-Hindu Class system and rest there as though there is nothing more to be said about the subject. The fact is there is a far bigger question which the Hindu has still to

face. He must take note of the fact that although every society consists of groups there are societies in which the groups are only non-social while there are societies in which the groups are anti-social. The difference between a society with the class system and a society with the caste system lies just in this namely the class system is merely non-social but the caste system is positively anti-social.

It may be important to realize why in some societies the group system produces only non-social feeling and in some societies the group system produces anti-social feeling. No better explanation of this difference can be given than the one given by professor John Dewey. According to him every thing depends upon whether the groups are isolated or associated, whether there is reciprocity of interest between them or whether there is lack of reciprocity of interest. If the groups are associated, if there is a reciprocity of interest between them the feeling between them will be only non-social. If the groups are isolated, if there is no reciprocity between them the feeling between them will be anti-social. To quote Professor Dewey<sup>1</sup>:

“The isolation and exclusiveness of a gang or clique brings its anti-social spirit into relief. But this same spirit is found wherever one group has interests ‘of its own’ which shut it out from full interaction with other groups, so that its prevailing purpose is the protection of what it has got, instead of reorganization and progress through wider relationships. It marks nations in their isolation from one another; families which seclude their domestic concerns as if they had no connection with a larger life; schools when separated from the interest of home and community; the divisions of rich and poor; learned and unlearned. The essential point is that isolation makes for rigidity and formal institutionalizing of life, for static and selfish ideals within the group.”

The question to be asked is not whether there are groups in a Society or whether the Society is one single whole. The question to be asked is what degree of association, cooperative intercourse and interaction exists among the different groups: how numerous and varied are the interests which are consciously shared by them: how full and free is the interplay with other forms of Association? A society is not to be condemned as body because there are groups in it. It is to be condemned if the groups are isolated, each leading an exclusive life of its own. Because it is this isolation which produces the anti-social spirit which makes co-operative effort so impossible of achievement.

This isolation among the classes is the work of Brahmanism. The principal steps taken by it was to abrogate the system of intermarriage

<sup>1</sup> Democracy and Education p. 99.

and interdining that was prevalent among the four Varnas in olden times. This has already been discussed in an earlier section of this chapter. There is however one part of the story that remains to be told. I have said the Varna system had nothing to do with marriage. That males and females belonging to the different Varnas could marry and did marry. Law did not come in the way of inter-varna marriage. Social morality was not opposed to such marriages. Savarna marriage was neither required by law nor demanded by Society. All marriages between different Varnas—irrespective of the question whether the bride was of a higher Varna than the bride-groom or whether the bride-groom was of the higher Varna and the bride of the lower Varna—were valid. Indeed as Prof. Kane says the distinction between Anuloma and Pratiloma marriage was quite unknown and even the terms Anuloma and Pratiloma were not in existence. They are the creation of Brahmanism. Brahmanism put a stop to Pratiloma marriages i.e. marriages between women of a higher Varna and men of lower Varna. That was a step in the direction of closing the connection between the Varnas and creating in them an exclusive and anti-social spirit regarding one another. But while the inter-connecting gate of the Pratiloma marriage was closed the inter-connecting gate of Anuloma marriage had remained open. That was not closed. As pointed out in the section on graded inequality Anuloma marriage i.e. marriage between a male of the higher Varna and the female of the lower Varna was allowed by Brahmanism to continue. The gate of Anuloma marriage was not very respectable and was a one way gate only, still it was an interconnecting gate by which it was possible to prevent a complete isolation of the Varnas. But even here Brahmanism played what cannot but be called a dirty trick. To show how dirty the trick was it is necessary first to state the rules which prevailed for determining the status of the child. Under the rule existing from very ancient times the status of the child was determined by the Varna of the father. The Varna of the mother was quite unimportant. The following illustrations will place the point beyond doubt:

Father's name	Varna of father	Mother's Name	Varna of mother	Child's name	Varna of child
1. Shantanu	Kshatriya	Ganga	Shudra (Anamik)	Bhishma	Kshatriya
2. Shantanu	Kshatriya	Matsyagandha	Shudra (Fisher)	Vichitra Virya	Kshatriya
3. Parashar	Brahmin	Matsyagandha	Shudra (Fisher)	Krishna-Dwaiipayana	Brahmin
4. Vishwamitra	Kshatriya	Menaka	(Apsara)	Shakuntala	Kshatriya
5. Yayati	Kshatriya	Devayani	Brahmin	Yadu	Kshatriya
6. Yayati	Kshatriya	Sharmishta	Asuri (Nonaryan)	Druhya	Kshatriya
7. Jaratkaru	Brahmin	Jaratkari	Nag. (Nonaryan)	Asita	Brahmin

The rule was known as the rule of Pitra Savarnya. It would be interesting to consider the effect of this rule of Pitra Savarnya on the Anuloma and Pratiloma systems of marriage.

The effect on Pratiloma marriage would be that the children of mothers of the higher Varnas would be dragged down to the level of the lower Varnas represented by their fathers. Its effect on Anuloma marriage would be just the contrary. The children of mothers of the lower Varnas would be raised up and absorbed in the higher Varnas of their fathers.

Manu stopped Pratiloma marriages and thereby prevented the higher from being dragged to the status of the lower. However regrettable, not much damage was done by it so long as the Anuloma marriage and the rule of Pitra Savarnya continued in operation. The two together formed a very useful system. The Anuloma marriage maintained the inter-connection and the Pitra Savarnya rule made the higher classes quite composite in their make up. For they could not but help to be drawn from mothers of different Varnas. Brahmanism did not want to keep this gate of intercommunication between the Varnas open. It was bent on closing it. But it did it in a manner which is disreputable. The straight and honourable way was to stop Anuloma marriage. But Brahmanism did not do that. It allowed the system of Anuloma marriage to continue. What it did was to alter the rule of determining the status of the child. It replaced the rule of Pitra Savarnya by the rule of Matra Savarnya by which the status of the child came to be determined by the status of the mother. By this change marriage ceased to be that means of intersocial communication which it principally is. It relieved men of the higher Varna from the responsibility to their children simply because they were born of a mother of lower Varna. It made Anuloma marriage mere matter of sex, a humiliation and insult to the lower Varnas and a privilege to the higher classes to lawfully commit prostitution with women of the lower classes. And from a larger social point of view it brought the complete isolation among the Varnas which has been the bane of Hindu Society. Notwithstanding all this the Orthodox Hindu still believes that the caste system is an ideal system. But why talk about the orthodox Hindus. There are among enlightened politicians and historians. There are of course Indians both politicians and historians who vehemently deny that the Caste system comes in the way of nationalism. They presume that India is a nation and feel very much offended if anybody instead of speaking of the Indian Nation speaks of the people of India. This attitude is quite understandable. Most of the politicians and historians are Brahmins and cannot be expected to have the courage to



expose the misdeeds of their ancestors or admit the evils perpetrated by them. Ask any one the question, is India a nation, and all in a chorus say, 'yes.' Ask for reasons, they will say that India is a nation firstly because India has a geographical unity of the country and secondly because of the fundamental unity of the culture. All this may be admitted for the sake of argument and yet it is true to say that to draw an inference from these facts that India is a nation is really to cherish a delusion. For what is a nation? A nation is not a country in the physical sense of the country whatever degree of geographical unity it may possess. A nation is not people synthesized by a common culture derived from common language, common religion or common race. To recall what I have said in another place "Nationality is a subjective psychological feeling. It is a feeling of a corporate sentiment of oneness which makes those who are charged with it feel that they are kith and kin. This national feeling is a double edged feeling. It is at once a feeling of fellowship for one's own kith and an anti-fellowship feeling for those who are not one's own kith. It is a feeling of "consciousness of kind" which binds together those who are within the limits of the kindred and severs them from those who are outside the limits of the kindred. It is a longing to belong to one's own group and a longing not to belong to any other group. This is the essence of what is called a nationality and national feeling. This longing to belong to one's own kindred as I said is a subjective psychological feeling and what is important to bear in mind is that the longing to belong to one's own kindred is quite independent of geography, culture or economic or social conflict. There may be geographical unity and yet there may be no "longing to belong". There may be no geographical unity and yet the feeling of longing to belong may be very intense. There may be cultural unity and yet there may be no longing to belong. There may be economical conflicts and class divisions and yet there may be an intense feeling of longing to belong. The point is that nationality is not primarily a matter of geography culture or".....

In the declining<sup>1</sup> days of the Vedic Regime, the Shudras as well as women had come to occupy a very low position. The rising tide of Buddhism had brought about a great change in the status of both. To put it briefly a Shudra under the Buddhist regime could acquire property, learning and could even become a king. Nay he could even rise to the highest rung of the social ladder occupied by the Brahmin in the Vedic Regime. The Buddhist order of Bhikshus was counterpart of the Vedic order of Brahmins. The two orders, each within its own

<sup>1</sup> By declining days I mean the period since when the Brahmins started disturbing the balance of Chaturvarnya system by asserting their supremacy.

religious system were on a par in the matter of status and dignity. The Shudra could never aspire to be a Brahmin in the Vedic regime but he could become a Bhikshu and occupy the same status and dignity as did the Brahmin. For, while the Vedic order of Brahmins was closed to the Shudra, the Buddhist order of Bhikshus was open to him and many Shudras who could not become Brahmins under the Vedic Regime had become their peers by becoming Bhikshus under Buddhism. Similar change is noticeable in the case of women. Under the Buddhist regime she became a free person. Marriage did not make her a slave. For marriage under the Buddhist rule was a contract. Under the Buddhist Regime she could acquire property, she could acquire learning and what was unique, she could become a member of the Buddhist order of Nuns and reach the same status and dignity as a Brahmin. The elevation of the status of the Shudras and women was so much the result of the gospel of Buddhism that Buddhism was called by its enemies as the Shudra religion (i.e. the religion of the low classes).

All this of course must have been very galling to the Brahmins. How very galling it must have been to them is shown by the vandalic fury with which Bramhanism after its triumph over Buddhism proceeded to bring about a complete demolition of the high status to which the Shudras and women had been elevated by the revolutionary changes effected by the vivifying gospel of Buddhism.

Starting with this background one shudders at the inhumanity and cruelty of the laws made by Manu against the Shudras. I quote a few of them assembling them under certain general heads.

Manu asks the householders of the Brahmana, Kshatriya and Vaishya Class :

IV. 61. Let him not dwell in a country where the rulers are Shudra.....

This cannot mean that Bramhana, Kashtriya and Vaishya should leave the country where Shudra is a ruler. It can only mean that if a Shudra becomes a king he should be killed. Not only a Shudra is not to be recognized as fit to be a king, he is not to be deemed as a respectable person. For Manu enacts that :—

XI. 24. A Bramhin shall never beg from a Shudra property for (performing) a sacrifice i.e. for religious purposes.

All marriage ties with the Shudra were proscribed. A marriage with a woman belonging to any of the three higher classes was forbidden. A Shudra was not to have any connection with a woman of the higher classes and an act of adultery committed by a Shudra with her was declared by Manu to be an offence involving capital punishment.

VIII. 374. A Shudra who has an intercourse with a woman of the higher caste guarded<sup>1</sup> or unguarded, shall be punished in the following manner; if she was unguarded, he loses the offending part. If she was guarded then he should be put to death and his property confiscated.

Manu insists that a Shudra shall be servile, unfit for office, without education, without property and as a contemptible person, his person and property shall always be liable to be conscripted.

As to office Manu prescribes.

VIII. 20. A Bramhana who is only a Brahmana by descent i.e. one has neither studied nor performed any other act required by the Vedas may, at the king's pleasure, interpret the law to him i.e. act as the Judge, but never a Shudra (however learned he may be).

VIII. 21. The Kingdom of that monarch who looks on while a Shudra settles the law will sink low like a cow in a morass.

VIII. 272. If a Shudra arrogantly presumes to preach religion to Bramhins the King shall have poured burning oil in his mouth and ears.

In olden times the study of the Vedas stood for education. Manu declare that the study of the Vedas was not a matter of right but that it was a matter of privilege. Manu deprived the Shudra of the right to study Veda. He made it a privilege of the three higher classes. Not only did he debar the Shudra from the study of the Vedas but he enacted penalties against those who might help the Shudra to acquire knowledge of the Veda. To a person who is privileged to study the Vedas, Manu ordains that :

IV. 99. He must never read the Vedas...in the presence of the Shudras.

and prescribes that :—

III. 156. He who instructs Shudra pupils and he whose teacher is a Shudra shall become disqualified for being invited to Shradha.

Manu's successor went much beyond him in the cruelty of their punishment of the Shudra for studying the Veda. For instance Katyayana lays down that if a Shudra overheard the Veda or ventured to utter a word of the Veda, the King shall cut his tongue in twain and put hot molten lead in his ears.

As to property Manu is both ruthless and shameless. According to the Code of Manu :

X. 129. No superfluous collection of wealth must be made by a Shudra, even though he has power to make it, since a servile man, who has amassed riches, becomes proud, and, by his insolence or neglect, gives pain to Bramhans.

<sup>1</sup> Guarded means under the protection of relation. Unguarded means living alone.

The reason for the rule is more revolting than the rule itself. Manu was of course not sure that the prohibitory injunction will be enough to prevent the Shudra from acquiring wealth. To leave no room for the Shudra to give offence to the Bramhins by his accumulation of wealth Manu added another section to his code whereby he declared that :

VIII. 417. A Bramhana may seize without hesitation if he be in distress for his subsistence, the goods of his Shudra.

Not only is the property of a Shudra liable to conscription but the labour of the Shudra, Manu declares, is liable to conscription. Compare the following provision in Manu :

VIII. 413. A Bramhana may compel a Shudra, whether bought or unbought to do servile work; for he is created by the creator to be the slave of a Bramhana.

A Shudra was required by Manu to be servile in his speech. How very servile he must be can be seen from the following provisions in Manu :—

VIII. 270. A Shudra who insults a twiceborn man with gross invective, shall have his tongue cut out; for he is of low origin.

VIII. 271. If he mentions the names and castes of the (twiceborn) with contumely, an iron nail, ten fingers long, shall be thrust red hot into his mouth.

Manu's object was to make the Shudra not merely a servile person but an altogether contemptible person. Manu will not allow a Shudra the comfort of having a high sounding name. Had Manu not been there to furnish incontrovertible proof it would be difficult to believe that Bramanism could have been so relentless and pitiless in its persecution of the Shudra. Observe Manu's law as to the names that the different classes can give to their children.

II. 31. Let the first part of a Brahman's name denote something auspicious, a Kshatriya's be connected with power, and a Vaishya's with wealth, but a Shudra's express something contemptible.

II. 32. The second part of a Bramhan's name shall be a word implying happiness, of a Kshatriya's a word implying protection, of a Vaisya's a term expressive of thriving and of a Shudra's an expression denoting service.

The basis of all these inhuman laws is the theory enunciated by Manu regarding the Shudra. At the outset of his Code, Manu takes care to assert it emphatically and without blushing. He says :

I. 91. One occupation only, the Lord prescribed to the Shudra, to serve meekly these other three castes (namely Bramhin, Kshatriya and Vaishya).

Holding that the Shudra was born to be servile, Manu made his laws accordingly so as to compel him to remain servile. In the Buddhist regime a Shudra could aspire to be a judge, a priest and even a king, the highest status that he could ever aspire to. Compare with this the ideal that Manu places before the Shudra and one can get an idea of what fate was to be under Brahmanism :

X. 121. If a Shudra, (unable to subsist by serving Brahmanas), seeks a livelihood, he may serve Kshartiyas, or he may also seek to maintain himself by attending on a wealthy Vaishya.

X. 122. But let a (Shudra) serve Brahmanas, either for the sake of heaven, or with a view to both (this life and the next); for he who is called the servant of a Brahmana thereby gains all his ends.

X. 123. The service of Brahmanas alone is declared (to be) an excellent occupation for a Shudra; for whatever else besides this he may perform will bear him no fruit.

X. 124. They must allot to him out of their own family (property) a suitable maintenance, after considering his ability, his industry, and the number of those whom he is bound to support.

X. 125. The remnants of their food must be given to him, as well as their old household furniture.

Manu can hardly be said to be more tender to women than he was to the Shudra. He starts with a low opinion of women. Manu proclaims :

II. 213. It is the nature of women to seduce men in this (world); for that reason the wise are never unguarded in (the company of) females.

II. 214. For women are able to lead astray in (this) world not only a fool, but even a learned man, and (to make) him a slave of desire and anger.

II. 215. One should not sit in a lonely place with one's mother sister or daughter; for the senses are powerful, and master even a learned man.

IX. 14. Women do not care for beauty, nor is their attention fixed on age; (thinking), '(It is enough that) he is a man', they give themselves to the handsome and to the ugly.

IX. 15. Through their passion for men, through their mutable temper, through their natural heartlessness, they become disloyal towards their husbands, however carefully they may be guarded in this (world).

IX. 16. Knowing their disposition, which the Lord of creatures laid in them at the creation, to be such, (every) man should most strenuously exert himself to guard them.

IX. 17. (When creating them) Manu allotted to women (a love of their) bed, (of their) seat and (of) ornament, impure desires, wrath, dishonesty, malice, and bad conduct.

The laws of Manu against women are of a piece with this view. Women are not to be free under any circumstances. In the opinion of Manu :—

IX. 2. Day and night women must be kept in dependence by the males (of) their (families), and, if they attach themselves to sensual enjoyments, they must be kept under one's control.

IX. 3. Her father protects (her) in childhood, her husband protects (her) in youth, and her sons protect (her) in old age; a woman is never fit for independence.

IX. 5. Women must particularly be guarded against evil inclinations, however trifling (they may appear); for, if they are not guarded, they will bring sorrow on two families.

IX. 6. Considering that the highest duty of all castes, even weak husbands (must) strive to guard their wives.

V. 147. By a girl, by a young woman, or even by an aged one, nothing must be done independently, even in her own house.

V. 148. In childhood a female must be subject to her father, in youth to her husband, when her lord is dead to her sons; a woman must never be independent.

V. 149. She must not seek to separate herself from her father, husband, or sons; by leaving them she would make both (her own and her husband's) families contemptible.

Woman is not to have a right to divorce.

IX. 45. The husband is declared to be one with the wife, which means that there could be no separation once a woman is married. Many Hindus stop here as though this is the whole story regarding Manu's law of divorce and keep on idolizing it by comforting their conscience by holding out the view that Manu regarded marriage as sacrament and therefore did not allow divorce. This of course is far from the truth. His law against divorce had a very different motive. It was not to tie up a man to a woman but it was to tie up the woman to a man and to leave the man free. For Manu does not prevent a man for giving up his wife. Indeed he not only allows him to abandon his wife but he also permits him to sell her. But what he does is to prevent the wife from becoming free. See what Manu Says :

IX. 46. Neither by sale nor by repudiation is a wife released from her husband.

The meaning is that a wife, sold or repudiated by her husband, can never become the legitimate wife of another who may have bought or received her after she was repudiated. If this is not monstrous nothing can be. But Manu was not worried by considerations of justice or injustice of his laws. He wanted to deprive women of the freedom she had under the Buddhistic regime. He knew, by her misuse of her liberty, by her willingness to marry the Shudra that the system of the gradation of the Varna had been destroyed. Manu was outraged by her license and in putting a stop to it he deprived her of her liberty.

A wife was reduced by Manu to the level of a slave in the matter of property.

IX. 146. A wife, a son, and a slave, these three are declared to have no property; the wealth which they earn is (acquired) for him to whom they belong.

When she becomes a widow Manu allows her maintenance if her husband was joint and a widow's estate in the property of her husband if he was separate from his family. But Manu never allows her to have any dominion over property.

A woman under the laws of Manu is subject to corporal punishment and Manu allows the husband the right to beat his wife.

VIII. 299. A wife, a son, a slave, a pupil, and a younger brother of the full blood, who have committed faults, may be beaten with a rope or a split bamboo.

In other matters woman was reduced by Manu to the same position as the Shudra.

The study of the Veda was forbidden to her by Manu as it was to the Shudra.

II. 66. Even for a woman the performance of the *Sanskaras* are necessary and they should be performed. But they should be performed without uttering the Veda Mantras.

IX. 18. Women have no right to study the Vedas. That is why their Sanskars are performed without Veda Mantras. Women have no knowledge of religion because they have no right to know the Vedas. The uttering of the Veda Mantras is useful for removing sin. As women cannot utter the Veda Mantras they are as unclean as untruth is.

Offering sacrifices according to Bramhanism formed the very soul of religion. Yet Manu will not allow women to perform them. Manu ordains that :—

XI. 36. A woman shall not perform the daily sacrifices prescribed by the Vedas.

XI. 37. If she does it she will go to hell.

To disable her from performing such sacrifices Manu prevents her from getting the aid and services of a Bramhin priest.

IV. 205. A Bramhan must never eat food given at a sacrifice performed by a woman.

IV. 206. Sacrifices performed by women are inauspicious and not acceptable to God. They should therefore be avoided.

Woman was not to have any intellectual pursuits and nor free will nor freedom of thought. She was not to join any heretical sect such as Buddhism. If she continues to adhere to it, till death she is not to be given the libation of water as is done in the case of all dead.

Finally a word regarding the ideal of life, Manu has sought to place before a woman. It had better be stated in his own words :

V. 151. Him to whom her father may give her, or her brother with the father's permission, she shall obey as long as he lives and when he is dead, she must not insult his memory.

V. 154. Though destitute of virtue, or seeking pleasure elsewhere, or devoid of good qualities, yet a husband must be constantly worshipped as a god by a faithful wife.

V. 155. No sacrifice, no vow, no fast must be performed by women, apart from their husbands; if a wife obeys her husband, she will for that reason alone be exalted in heaven.

Then comes the choicest texts which forms the pith and the marrow of this ideal which Manu prescribes for the women :

V. 153. The husband who wedded her with sacred Mantras, is always a source of happiness to his wife, both in season and out of season, in this world and in the next.

V. 150. She must always be cheerful, clever in the management of her household affairs, careful in cleaning her utensils, and economical in expenditure.

This the Hindus regard as a very lofty ideal for a woman !!!

The severity of these laws against Shudras and women show that the phenomenal rise of these classes during the Buddhist regime had not only offended the Brahmins but had become intolerable to them. It was a complete reversal of their sacred social order from top to bottom. The first had become last and the last had become first. The laws of Manu also explain, the determined way in which the Brahmins proceeded to use their political power to degrade the Shudras and the women to their old status. The triumphant Bramhanism began its onslaught on both the Shudras and the women in pursuit of the old ideal namely servility and Bramhanism did succeed in making the Shudras and women the servile classes, Shudras the serfs to the three higher classes and women the serfs to their husbands. Of the black



deeds committed by Brahmanism after its triumph over Buddhism this one is the blackest. There is no parallel in history for so foul deeds of degradation committed by a class of usurpers in the interest of class domination. The colossal character of this deed of degradation perpetrated by Barahmanism is unfortunately not fully realized. It is concealed by those small monosyllabic words, Stri and Shudra. Let those who wish to get an idea of the enormity of their deed think of the numbers that lie behind these two terms. What part of the population do they apply to? The woman represents one half of the population. Of the balance the Shudra represents not less than two third. The two together make up about 75% of the total population. It is this huge mass of people that has been doomed by Brahmanism to eternal servility and eternal degradation. It is because of the colossal scale of degradation whereby 75% of her people were deprived of their right to life, liberty and persuit of happiness that India became a decaying if not a dead nation.

The principle of graded inequality runs through the whole of the Manu Smriti. There is no department of life in which he has not introduced his principle of graded inequality. For a complete and thorough exposition of it, it would be necessary to reproduce the whole of Manu Smriti. I will take only a few departments to illustrate how in the hands of Manu the principle of graded inequality became imbedded in the social life.

Take the field of marriage. Observe the rule of Manu :—

III. 13. It is declared that a Shudra woman alone (can be) the wife of a Shudra, she and one of his own caste (the wives) of a Vaishya, those two and one of his own caste the wives of a Kshatriya, those three and one of his own caste (the wives of a Bramhan).

Take the rules of Manu regarding the treatment of guests :—

III. 110. But a Kshatriya (who comes) to the house of a Brahmana is not called a guest (atithi), nor a Vaisya, nor a Shudra, nor a personal friend, nor a relative, nor the teacher.

III. 111. But if Kshatriya comes to the house of a Brahmana in the manner of a guest, (the house-holder) may feed him according to his desire, after the above mentioned Brahmanas have eaten.

III. 112. Even a Vaisya and a Shudra who have approached his house in the manner of guests, he may allow to eat with his servants, showing (thereby) his compassionate disposition.

In the house of a Brahmana, nobody except a Brahmin is to have the honour of being a guest.<sup>1</sup> If the Kshatriya comes in the manner

<sup>1</sup> The word guest is used by Manu in a technical sense and means a Bramhana who stays one night only see III. 102.

of a guest to the house of a Brahmin he is to be fed after all the Brahmins are fed and if the Vaishyas and Shudras come in the manner of guests they are to be fed after everybody is fed and only in the company of servants.

Take the rules of Manu regarding Sanskaras:

X. 126. A Shudra has no right to receive the sacraments.

X. 68. The law prescribes that neither of the two (that is those who belong to mixed castes) shall receive the sacraments the first being excluded on account of lowness of his origin of his parents was against the order of the castes.

II. 66. The whole series<sup>1</sup> of sacraments must be performed for females also in order to sanctify the body at the proper time and in the proper order, but without the recitation of sacred Vedic Mantras. Manu further lays down that :

VI. 1. A twice born Snataka, who has thus lived according to the law in the order of householders, may, taking a firm resolution and keeping his organs in subjection, dwell in the forest, duly (observing the rules given below).

VI. 33. But having thus passed the third part of (a man's natural term of) life in the forest, he may live as an ascetic during the fourth part of his existence, after abandoning all attachment to worldly objects.

Even in law Manu introduces the principle of graded inequality. To take only two illustrations, the law of defamation, abuse and the law of assault :

VIII. 267. A Kshatriya having defamed a Brahmana, shall be fined one hundred (panas); A Vaisya one hundred and fifty or two hundred; a Shudra shall suffer corporal punishment.

VIII. 268. A Brahmana shall be fined fifty (panas) for defaming a Kshatriya; in (the case of) a Vaisya the fine shall be twenty five (panas); in (the case of) a Shudra twelve.

VIII. 269. For offences of twice born men against those of equal caste (varna, the fine shall be) also twelve (panas) for speeches which ought not to be uttered, that (and every fine shall be) double.

VIII. 276. (For mutual abuse) by a Brahmana and a Kshatriya a fine must be imposed by a discerning (king), on the Brahmana the lowest amercement, but on the Kshatriya the middlemost.

VIII. 277. A Vaisya and a Shudra must be punished exactly in the same manner according to their respective castes, but the tongue (of the Shudra) shall not be cut out; that is the decision.

<sup>1</sup> Except Upanayan which is forbidden for women.

VIII. 279. With whatever limb a man of a low caste does hurt to (a man of the three) highest (castes), even that limb shall be cut off; that is the teaching of Manu.

VIII. 280. He who raises his hand or a stick, shall have his hand cut off; he who in anger kicks with his foot, shall have his foot cut off.

Everywhere is the principle of graded inequality. So ingrained it had become in the social system that the successors of Manu were careful to introduce it where he had failed to give effect to it. For instance Manu had recognized the system of slavery. But had failed to prescribe whether the system of slavery was or was not subject to the principle of graded order of insubordination.

Lest it should be understood that the law of graded inequality did not apply to slavery and that a Brahmin may be a slave of the Shudra, Yajnavalkya at once proceeds to clear the doubt. He expressly laid down that :—

“Slavery is in the descending order of the Varnas and not in the ascending order” (XIV. 183).

Vijnaneshwar in his commentary on Yajnavalkya makes it concrete by his illustrations when he says :

“Of the Varnas such as the Brahmana and the rest, a state of slavery shall exist *Anulomyena*, in the descending order. Thus, of a Brahmana, a Kshatriya and the rest may become a slave; of a Kshatriya, the Vaishya and the Shudra; and of a Vaishya, Shudra, thus the state of slavery shall operate in the descending order.”

Stated in the language of equality and inequality, this means that the Brahmin is the highest because he can be the slave of nobody but is entitled to keep a person of any class as his slave. The Shudra is the lowest because everybody can keep him as his slave but he can keep no one as his slave except a Shudra. The place assigned to the Kshatriya and the Vaishya introduces the system of graded inequality. A Kshatriya while he is inferior to the Brahmin he can be the slave of the Brahmin. While he is yet superior to the Vaishyas and the Shudras because he can keep them as his slaves; the Vaishyas and the Shudras have no right to keep a Kshatriya as his slave. Similarly a Vaishya while he is inferior to the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas, because they can keep him as their slave and he cannot keep any one of them as his slave, he is proud that he is at least superior to the Shudra because he can keep the Shudra as his slave while Shudra cannot keep the Vaishya as his slave.

Such is the principle of graded inequality which Brahmanism injected into the bone and the marrow of the people. Nothing worse to paralyze society to overthrow inequity could have been done.

Although its effects have not been clearly noticed there can be no doubt that because of it the Hindus have been stricken with palsy. Students of social organization have been content with noting the difference between equality and inequality. None have realized that in addition to equality and inequality there is such a thing as graded inequality. Yet inequality is not half so dangerous as graded inequality. Inequality carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Inequality does not last long. Under pure and simple inequality two things happen. It creates general discontent which forms the seed of revolution. Secondly it makes the sufferers combine against a common foe and on a common grievance. But the nature and circumstances of the system of graded inequality leave no room for either of these two things to happen. The system of graded inequality prevents the rise of general discontent against inequity. It cannot therefore become the storm centre of revolution. Secondly the sufferers under inequality becoming unequal both in terms of the benefit and the burden there is no possibility of a general combination of all classes to overthrow the inequity. To make the thing concrete the Brahmanic law of marriage is full of inequity. The right of Brahmana to take a woman from the classes below him but not to give a woman to them is in inequity. But the Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra will not combine to destroy it. The Kshatriya resents this right of the Brahmana. But he will not combine with Vaishya or the Shudra and that for two reasons. Firstly because he is satisfied that if the Brahman has the right to take the right of three communities, the Kshatriya has the right to appropriate the women of two communities. He does not suffer so much as the other two. Secondly if he joins in a general revolution against this marriage-inequity in one way he will rise to the level of the Brahmins but in another way all will be equal which to him means that the Vaishyas and the Shudras will rise to his level i.e. they will claim Kshatriya women-which means he will fall to their level. Take any other inequity and think of a revolt against it. The same social psychology will show that a general rebellion against it is impossible.

One of the reasons why there has been no revolution against Brahmanism and its inequities is due entirely to the principle of graded inequality. If is a system of permitting a share in the spoils with a view to enlist them to support the spoils system. It is a system full of low cunning which man could have invented to perpetuate inequity and to profit by it. For it is nothing else but inviting people to share in inequity in order that they may all be supporters of inequity.

There now remains to lift the curtain from the last act of this drama of Bramhanism.

Bramhanism inherited from the Vedic past that system of Chaturvarna. The system of Chaturvarna which the Hindus regard as the unique creation of their Aryan ancestors is in no sense unique. There is nothing original about it. The whole ancient world had stumbled into it. The Egyptians had it and the ancient Persians had it. Plato was so convinced about its excellence that he presented it as ideal form of social organization. The ideal of the Chaturvarna is faulty. The lumping together of individuals into a few sharply marked off classes is a very superficial view of man and his powers. The Ancient Aryans as well as Plato had no conception of the uniqueness of every individual, of his incommensurability with others and of each individual forming a class of his own. They had no recognition of the infinite diversity of active tendencies and combination of tendencies of which an individual is capable. To them there were types of faculties or powers in the individual constitution and all that is necessary for social organization is to classify them. All this is demonstrably wrong. Modern science has shown that lumping together of individuals into a few sharply marked off classes each confined to one particular sphere does injustice both to the individual and to Society. The stratification of Society by classes and occupations is incompatible with the fullest utilization of the qualities which is so necessary for social advancement and is also incompatible with the safety and security of the individual as well as of Society in general.<sup>1</sup>

There is another mistake which the Ancient Hindus including Plato made. There is probably some truth in saying that there is among human beings a dimorphism or polyformism in human beings as there is among insects, though in the former it is only psychological while in the latter it is both physical as well as psychological. But assuming that there is a thing psychological dimorphism or polyformism among human beings, it is wrong to separate them into those who are born to do one thing and others to do another, some born to command i.e. to be masters and some born to obey i.e. to be slaves. It is wrong to suppose that in a given person some qualities are present and others are absent. On the contrary the truth is that all qualities are present in every person and this truth is not diminished in any way by that, some tendency predominates to the extent of being the only one that is apparent. So well established is this truth that a tendency which may be dominant in a man at one time may be quite different from and even the direct opposite of the tendency that may be dominant at another time. As Prof. Bergson<sup>2</sup> in speaking of the Nietzsche's false antithesis of 'men' and 'slaves' observes :

<sup>1</sup> For further consideration of this subject see my tract on "Annihilation of Caste."

<sup>2</sup> "Two sources of Morality", (Holt), p. 267.

“We have a clear vision of this (falsity) in times of revolution. Unassuming citizens, upto that moment humble and obedient, wake up one fine day with pretensions to be leaders of men”.

The cases of Mussolini and Hitler are a complete disproof of the theory of the Aryans and of Plato.

This Vedic system of Chaturvarna, far from being an ideal system was made positively worse by the changes which Bramhanism made and which have already been described. Every one of them was mischievous in character is beyond question. The Buddhist order of Bhikshus and the Vedic order of Brahmins were designed to serve the same purpose. They formed the elite of their society whose function was to lead and guide society along the right road. Although designed to discharge the same function the Buddhist Bhikshu was better placed to discharge it than was the Bramhin. That is because Buddha recognized one thing which nobody either before him or after him has done. Buddha realized that for a person to give a true lead to Society and be its trustworthy guide he must be intellectually free and further, which is more important, to be intellectually free he must not have private property. An elite charged with the care of his private property must fail to discharge his duty of leading and guiding Society along the right road. Buddha therefore took care to include in the Code of discipline for the Bhikshus a rule prohibiting a Bhikshu from holding private property. In the Vedic order of Bramhins there was no such prohibition. A Bramhin was free to hold property. This difference produced a profound difference on the character and outlook of the Buddhist Bhikshu and the Vedic Bramhin. The Bhikshus formed an intellectual class. The Bramhins formed on the other hand merely an educated class. There is a great difference between an intellectual class and an educated class. An intellectual class has no limitations arising out of any affiliations to any class or to any interest. An educated Class on the other hand is not an intellectual class although it has cultivated its intellect. The reason is that its range of vision and its sympathy to a new ideology is circumscribed by its being identified with the interest of the class with which it is affiliated.

The Bramhins from the very beginning therefore were inclined to be a purely educated class, enlightened but selfish. This evil in the Vedic order of Bramhins was extreme by the changes made in the old Vedic System. The right of the Brahmins to rule and the grant of special privileges and immunities made them more selfish, and induced in them the desire to use their education not for the advancement of learning but for the use of their community and against the advancement of society.

All their energy and their education has been spent in maintaining their own privileges against the good of the public. It has been the boast of many Hindu authors that the civilization of India is the most ancient civilization in the world. They will insist that there was no branch of knowledge in which their ancestors were not the pioneers. Open a book like "The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology" by Prof. Benoy Kumar Sarkar, or a book like "The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus" by Dr. Brajendranath Seal one is overwhelmed with data touching upon the knowledge their ancestors had about various scientific subjects. From these books it would appear that the ancient Indians knew astronomy, astrology, biology, chemistry, mathematics, Medicine, minerology, Physics and in the view of the mass of people even aviation. All this may be very true. The important question is now how the ancient Indians discovered these positive sciences. The important question is why did the ancient Indians cease to make any progress in the sciences in which they were the pioneers? This sudden arrest in the progress of science in ancient India is as astounding as it is deplorable. In the scientific world India occupies a position which even if it be first among the primitive is certainly last among the civilized nation. How did it happen that a people who began the work of scientific progress stopped, halted on the way, left in its incoherent and incomplete condition? This is a question that needs to be considered and answered, not what the ancient Indians knew.

There is only one answer to the question and it is a very simple answer. In ancient India the Brahmins were the only educated class. They were also the Class which was claiming to be above all others. Buddha disputed their claim for supremacy and declared a war on the Brahmins. The Brahmins acted as an Educated Class—as distinguished from an intellectual class—would act under the circumstances. It abandoned all pursuits and engaged itself in defending the claim of supremacy and the social, economic and political interests of its class. Instead of writing books on Science, the Brahmins undertook to write Smritis. Here is an explanation why the progress of science in India became arrested. Brahmins found it more important and more imperative to write Smritis to repel the Buddhist doctrine of social equality.

How many Smritis did the Brahmins write?

Mr. Kane a great authority on the Smriti literature has computed their number to be 128. And what for? The Smritis are called lawbooks which of course hide their nature. They are really treatises expounding the supremacy of the Brahmins and their rights to special privileges. The defence of Brahmanism was more important than the

progress of science. Bramhanism not only defended its privileges but set about extending them in a manner that would cover every descent man with shame. The Brahmins started particularly to expand the meaning of certain privileges granted to them by Manu.

Manu had given the Bramhins the right to *dana*, gift. The *dana* was always intended to be money or chattel. But in course of time the concept of *dana* was expanded so as to include the gift of a woman which a Brahmin could keep as his mistress or who could be released by the Bramhin on commutation<sup>1</sup> of money payment.

Manu designated the Bramhins as Bhu-devas, lords of the Earth. The Bramhins enlarged the scope of this statement and began to claim the right to sexual intercourse with women of other classes. Even queens were not exempt from this claim. Ludovico Di Varthema who came to India as a traveller in about 1502 A.D. records the following about the Brahmins of Calicut :

“It is a proper, and the same time pleasant thing to know who these Brahmins are. You must know that they are the chief persons of the faith, as priests are among us. And when the King takes a wife, he selects the most worthy and the most honoured of these Brahmins and makes him sleep the first night with his wife, in order that he may deflower her.”<sup>2</sup>

Similarly Hamilton<sup>3</sup> another writer says:

“When the Samorin marries, he must not cohabit with his bride till the Nambourie (Nambudari Brahmin), or chief priest, has enjoyed her, and if he pleases, he may have three nights of her company, because the first fruits of her nuptials must be an holy oblation to the god she worships.”

In the Bombay Presidency the priests of the Vaishnava sect claimed the right to deflower the women of their sect. This gave rise to the famous Maharaja Libel case brought by the chief priest of the Sect against one Karosondas Mulji in the High Court of Bombay in the year 1869 which shows that the right to claim the benefit of the first night was certainly effective till then.

When such a right to sexual cohabitation for the first night could be extended against the generality of the lower classes the Brahmins did not hesitate to extend it. This they did particularly in Malabar. There, Manu designated the Brahmins as Bhu-devas, lords of the earth. The Brahmins enlarged the scope of this statement and began to claim the

<sup>1</sup> I remember reading the report of a case in which a Brahmin who had taken a married wife as Dana refused to release her even though commutation was offered by her husband.

<sup>2</sup> “The Travels of Ludovico Di Varthema” (Pub. Hakyt Society) Page 141. Varthema adds “Do not imagine that the Brahmin goes willingly to perform this operation. The King is even obliged to pay him four hundred or five hundred ducats.

<sup>3</sup> A New Account of the East Indies (1744) Vol. I. page 310.



right of promiscuous sexual intercourse with the women folk of the other Classes. This happened particularly in Malabar. There<sup>1</sup>

“The Brahman castes follow the Makatyam System that is the system by which the child belongs to its father’s family. They contract within their own caste regular marriages, with all the ordinary legal and religious sanctions and incidents. But the Brahmin men are also in the habit of entering into Sambandhan-Unions with women of the lower castes.”

This is not all. Observe further what the writer has to say:

“Neither party to a Sambadhan Unions becomes thereby a member of the other family; and the offspring of the Union belong to their mothers *tharwad* (family) and have no sort of claim, so far as the law goes, to a share of their father’s property or to maintenance therefrom.”

Speaking of the origin of this practice the author of the Gazetteer observes that the origin of this institution:

“Is found in the claim of the Bhu-devas” or “Earth Gods” (that the Brahmanas) and on a lower plain of the Kshatriyas or the ruling classes, to the first fruits of lower Caste Womanhood, a right akin to the medieval *droit de Seigneurie*.”

It is an understatement to say that it is only a right to first fruits as the ‘right to the first night’ was called in the middle ages in Europe. It is more than that. It is a general right of the Brahmin against the lower caste to claim any woman of that class for mere prostitution, for the mere satisfaction of sexual appetite, without burdening the Brahmin to any of the obligations of marriage.

Such were the rights which the Brahmins the spiritual precepts claimed against the laity!! The Borgese Popes have been run down in history as the most debauched race of spiritual preceptors who ascended the throne of Peter. One wonders whether they were really worse than the Brahmins of India.

A purely intellectual Class, free to consider general good and having no interest of a class to consider, such as the one contemplated by Buddha is not to be had anywhere. For the limitations resulting from property on the freedom of intellect of the elite have not been generally recognized until very recently. But this want of an intellectual class has been made good in other countries by the fact that in those countries each Strata of Society has its educated class. There is safety, if no definite guidance, in the multiplicity of views expressed by different educated classes drawn from different strata of society. In such a multiplicity of views there is no danger of Society being misguided or

<sup>1</sup> Gazetteer of Malabar and Anjengo District by Mr. C. A. Innes Vol. I. p. 95

misdirected by the views of one single educated class drawn from one single class of society and which is naturally bound to place the interest of its class before the interests of the country. By the change made by Brahmanism India ceased to have safe and sure guidance of an intellectual class. But what is worse is that the Hindus lost the safety and security which other peoples have and which arises from the multiplicity of views expressed by various educated classes drawn from different strata of Society.

By the denial of education to the Shudras, by diverting the Kshatriyas to military pursuits, and the Vaishyas to trade and by reserving education to themselves the Brahmins alone could become the educated class—free to misdirect and misguide the whole society. By converting Varna into Caste they declared that mere birth was a real and final measure of the worth of a man. Caste and Graded inequality made disunity and discord a matter of course.

All this disfigurement of the original Varna system would have been tolerable if it had remained a mere matter of social practice. But Brahmanism was not content to leave the matter there. It wanted to give the Chaturvarna in its changed and perverted form the force of law. This new Chaturvarna the making of Brahmanism occupies in the Manu Smriti as the Law of Persons and the Law of Family. Nobody can make a mistake about it. Manu made it an offence for a person of a lower Caste to arrogate to himself the status of a higher Caste or to pass off as a member of the higher Caste.

X. 96. A man of low caste who through covetousness lives by the occupations of a higher one, the king shall deprive of his property and banish.

XI. 56. Falsely attributing to oneself high birth, giving information to the king (regarding a crime), and falsely accusing one's teacher, (are offences) equal to slaying a Brahmana.

Here there are two offences, General Impersonation (X. 96) and impersonation by the Shudra (XI. 56). Note also the punishments how severe they are. For the first the punishment is confiscation of property and banishment. For the second the punishment is the same as the punishment for causing the death of a Brahmin.

The offence of personation is not unknown in modern jurisprudence and the Indian Penal Code recognizes it in section 419. But what is the punishment the Indian Penal Code prescribes for cheating by personation? Fine, and if imprisonment, then 3 years or both. Manu must be turning in his grave to find the British Government make so light of his law of Caste.

Manu next proceeds to direct the king that he should execute this law. In the first placé he appeals to the King in the name of his pious duty:

VIII. 172. By preventing the confusion of Castes . . . . .the power of the King grows, and he prospers in this world and after death.

Manu perhaps knows that the law relating to the confusion of Varna may not be quite agreeable to the conscience of the king and he avoids enforcement. Consequently Manu tells the King how in the matter of the execution of the laws the King should act:

VIII. 177. Therefore let the King not heeding his own likes and dislikes behave exactly like Yama.

i.e. he should be as impartial as Yama the Judge of the Dead.

Manu however does not wish to leave the matter to the King as a mere matter of pious duty. Manu makes it a matter of obligation upon the King. Accordingly Manu lays down as a matter of obligation that:

VIII. 410. The King should order a Vaishya to trade to lend money, to cultivate the land, or to lend cattle, and the Shudra to serve the twice born Caste.

Again Manu reverts to the subject and say:

VIII. 418. The King should carefully compel Vaishyas and Sudras to perform the work (prescribed) for them; for if these two castes swerved from their duties they would throw this whole world into confusion.

What if the Kings do not act up to this obligation. This law of Chaturvarna is so supreme in the eyes of Manu that Manu will not allow himself to be thwarted by a King who will not keep his obligation to maintain this law. Boldly Manu forges a new law that such a king shall be disposed. One can imagine how dear Chaturvarna was to Manu and to Brahmanism.

As I have said the Chaturvarna of the Vedic system was better than caste system was not very favourable to the creation of a Society which could be regarded as one single whole possessing the Unity of the ideal society. By its very theory the Chaturvarna has given birth to four classes. These four classes were far from friendly. Often they were quarreling and their quarrels were so bitter that they cannot but be designated as Class wars. All the same this old Chaturvarna had two saving features which Brahminism most selfishly removed. Firstly there was no isolation among the Varnas. Intermarriage and interdining the two strongest bonds for unity had full play. There was no room for the different Varnas to develop that anti-social feeling which destroys the very basis of Society. While the Kshatriyas fought against the Brahmins and the Brahmins fought against the Kshatriyas there were

not wanting Kshatriyas who fought against the Kshatriyas<sup>1</sup> for the sake of Brahmins and there were not wanting Brahmins<sup>2</sup> who joined hands with Kshatriyas to put down the Brahmins.

Secondly this old Chaturvarna was conventional. It was the ideal of the Society but it was not the law of the State. Brahmanism isolated the Varnas and sowed the seed of antagonism. Brahmanism made legal what was only conventional. By giving it a legal basis it perpetrated the mischief. The Vedic Chaturvarna if it was an evil would have died out by force of time and circumstances. By giving it the force of Law Brahmanism has made it eternal. This is probably the greatest mischief that Brahmanism has done to Hindu Society.

In considering this question one cannot fail to notice that the obligation imposed upon the King for the maintenance of the law of Chaturvarna which is another name for the system of graded inequality does not require the King to enforce it against the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas. The obligation is limited to the enforcement of the law against the Vaishyas and the Shudras. Having regard to the fact that Brahmanism was so intent on giving the system the force of law the result has been very awkward to say the least about it. Notwithstanding this attempt at legalization the system remained half legal and half conventional, legal as to the Vaishyas and the Shudras and merely conventional as to Brahmins and Kshatriyas.

This difference needs to be accounted for. Was Brahmanism honest in its attempt to give the system the force of law? Did it wish that each of the four Varnas be bound by it? The fact that Brahmanism would not bind the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas by the law it made, shows that in this business Brahmanism was far from honest. If it believed in the system as ideal it could not have failed to make it an universal binding force.

But there is more than dishonesty in this foul game. One can quite understand why the Brahmins were left free and untrammelled by the shackles of the law. Manus called them Gods on earth and Gods must be above the law. But why were the Kshatriyas left free in the same way as the Brahmins. He knows that the Kshatriyas will not humble themselves before the Brahmins. He then proceeds to warn them, how the Brahmins can punish them if the Kshatriyas show arrogance and plan rebellion.

IX. 320 When the Kshatriyas become in any way overbearing towards the Brahmanas, the Brahmanas themselves shall duly restrain them; for the Kshatriyas sprang from the Brahmanas.

<sup>1</sup> This is how I interpret the story of Parashuram's war against the Kshatriyas.

<sup>2</sup> Buddhism was a revolt against Brahmins and Brahminism. Yet many of the early followers of Buddha & Buddhism were Brahmins.

IX. 321. Fire sprang from water, Kshatriya from Brahmanas, iron from stone; the all-penetrating force of those (three) has no effect on that whence they were produced.

One might think that the reason why Manu does not impose an obligation upon the King to enforce the law against the Kshatriya was because the Brahmins felt themselves quite capable of dealing with Kshatriyas by their own prowess and without the aid of the King and that they meant to put their sanctions against the Kshatriyas when the time came and without fear of consequences. All this could not have been meant by Manu. For after uttering this vows of vengeance, and threats and imprecations Manu suddenly come down and begins to plead with the Kshatriyas for cooperation and common front with the Brahmins. In a verse next after the verse in which he utters the threats and imprecations against the Kshatriyas Manu pleads:

IX. 323. But (a king who feels his end drawing nigh) shall bestow all his wealth, accumulated from fines on Brahmanas, make over his kingdom to his son and then seek death in battle.

From imprecations to supplication is a very queer cry. What is the explanation of this anti-climax in the attitude of this strange behaviour of Manu towards the Kshatriyas? What is the object of this cooperation between Brahmins and Kshatriyas? Against whom is this common front to be? Manu does not explain. A whole history of a thousand years must be told before this puzzle is solved and the questions satisfactorily answered.

The history which furnishes the clue to the solution of this puzzle is the history of the class wars between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas.

Most of the orthodox Hindus are repelled by the doctrine of Class war which was propounded by Karl Marx and would be certainly shocked if they were told that the history of their own ancestors probably furnishes the most cogent evidence that Marx was searching for support of his theory. Indeed there have been numerous class wars between Brahmins and the Kshatriyas and only the most important of them have been recorded<sup>1</sup> in the ancient Hindu literature. We have record of the conflict between the Brahmins and the Kings who were all Kshatriyas. The first of these conflicts was a conflict with King Vena, the second with Pururavas, the third with Nahusha, fourth with Nimi and fifth with Sumukha. There is a record of a conflict between Vashishtha a Brahmin and Vishvamitra an ordinary Kshatriya and not a king. Then we have the record of the wholesale massacre of the Brahmins of Bhṛigu clan by the Kshatriya descendants of Kratavirya

<sup>1</sup> All this record has been collected by Prof. Muir in his *Original Sanskrit Texts*. Vol. I.

and then we have the record of the whole class of Kshatriyas exterminated by Parashuram acting on behalf of the Brahmanas. The issues that brought them in conflict extended over a wide range and show how bitter and strained must have been the feelings between Brahmins and Kshatriyas. There were conflicts over the question whether the Kshatriya had a right to become a Brahmana. There were conflicts over the question, whether the Brahmins were subject to the authority or not. There were conflicts on the question who should salute first and who should give way to whom. The wars were wars<sup>1</sup> of authority, status and dignity.

The results of these wars could not but be obvious to the Brahmins. Notwithstanding their boastful utterances they must have realized that it was not possible for them to crush the Kshatriyas and that notwithstanding the wars of extermination the Kshatriyas survived in sufficient numbers to plague the Brahmins. One need not pay any attention to the filthy story told by the Brahmins and alluded to by Manu that the Kshatriyas of the Manu's day were not the original Kshatriyas but a race of new Kshatriyas begotten by the Brahmins upon the widows of the old Kshatriyas who were massacred by Parashuram. Blackmailing is one of the means which Brahmanism is never ashamed of using to advance its own purposes. The fight of Brahmanism against the Kshatriyas was from the very beginning a fight between a fool and a bully. Brahmanas were fighting against the Kshatriyas for the maintenance of the Chaturvarna. Now it is this very Chaturvarna which allowed bayonets to the Kshatriyas and denied them to the Brahmins. How under this theory could the Brahmin fight with the Kshatriya with any hope of success? It could not have taken long for the Brahmins to realise the truth—which Tallyrand told Napoleon—that it is easy to give bayonets but it is very difficult to sit on them and that as Kshatriyas had bayonets and Brahmins none, war with the Kshatriya was the way to ruin. These were the direct consequences of these wars between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas. But there were others which could not have escaped the attention of the Brahmins. While the Brahmins and Kshatriyas were fighting among themselves nobody was left to check and keep the Vaishyas and the Shudras under control. They were on the road of social equality almost nearing to the status of the Brahmins and Kshatriyas. To Brahmanism the possibility of suppressing the Kshatriya was very remote and the danger of being overtaken by Vaishyas and Shudras were real and very real. Should the Brahmana continue to fight the Kshatriya and ignore the danger of the Vaishyas and the Shudras? Or Should the Brahmana give up the hopeless struggle against the

<sup>1</sup> See Hopkins History of the Ruling Races.

Kshatriya and befriend him and make with him a common cause and suppress the growing menace of the Vaishyas and Shudras? Brahmanism after it was exhausted in the wars with the Kshatriyas chose the second alternative. It sought to befriend their worthwhile enemies the Kshatriyas to work for a new ideal namely to enslave and exploit the two classes below them namely the Vaishyas and the Shudras. This new ideal must have taken shape some time when the Satpatha Brahmana came to be composed. It is in the Satpatha Brahmana we find the new ideal expressed it was well established. The language in which it is expressed, and the subject to which it is applied are so telling that I feel it should be quoted in its original terms. Says the author of the Satpatha<sup>1</sup>:

“They then make the beast return (to the Ahavaniya<sup>2</sup>) the he-goat goes first of them, then the ass, then the horse. Now in going away from this (Ahavaniya) the horse goes first, then the ass, then the he-goat—for the horse corresponds to the Kshatra (nobility), the ass to the Vaishya and Shudra, the he-goat to the Brahman and in-as-much as, in going from here, the horse goes first, therefore the Kshatriya, going first, is followed by the three others castes; and in-as-much as, in returning from here, the he-goat goes first, therefore the Brahman, going first, is followed by the three other castes. And in-as-much as the ass does not go first, either in going back from here, or in coming back from there, therefore the Brahmana and Kshatriya never go behind the Vaishya and Sudra; hence they walk thus in order to avoid a confusion between good and bad. And, moreover, he thus encloses those two castes (the Vaishyas and Sudra) on both sides by the priesthood and the nobility and makes them submissive.”

Here is the explanation of the puzzling attitude of Manu towards the Kshatriyas, attitude of willing to wound but afraid to strike, of wishing to dictate but preferring to befriend.

It is these wars and the compromise that had taught Manu that it was no use trying to coerce the Kshatriyas to submit to the domination of the Brahmin. It may be an ideal to be kept up. But as practical politics it was an impossible ideal. Like Bismark, Manu knew that politics was the game of the possible. What was possible was to make a common cause and to build up a common front between the Brhamins and the Kshatriyas against the Vaishyas and the Shudras and this is what Manu did. The pity of it is that it was done in the name of religion. This need not shock anybody who has studied the soul and spirit of Brahmanism. With Brahmanism religion is a cloak to cover and hide its acquisitive politics.

<sup>1</sup> Eggeling: Sathapatha Brahmana. Part III. pp. 226-27.

<sup>2</sup> Avavaniya.

## The Morals of the House

*This is 61 page typed manuscript This is a second copy but it is having corrections and modifications by Dr. Ambedkar himself. It is reproduced here taking all the corrections into account. There is one separate file entitled 'Manu Smriti or the Gospel of Counter-Revolution'. In that copy notes on Manu Smriti under various categories have been drawn. However, all these notes have been found to be incorporated in this essay, 'Morals of the House.' It is felt that the printing of these notes would be a mere repetition of this essay. Hence, the said copy is not separately printed:*

## I

The morals of the Hindus and their religious creed are prescribed by the *Smritis* which form a part of the Sacred literature of the Hindus. It is to the *Smritis* that one must go to understand the Ethics and the Religion of the Hindus. The *Smritis* are by no means few in number. A conservative estimate gives the total number of *Smritis* to be 108. The large number of *Smritis* cannot however make our problem difficult. For though the *Smritis* are numerous they do not differ in essentials. Indeed they repeat one another so closely that reading the *Smritis* creates a most monotonous task. They are all derived from one common source. That source is the *Smriti* of Manu otherwise known as *Manava Dharma Shastra*. The other *Smritis* are faithful repetitions of the *Manu Smriti*. A study of the *Manu Smriti* is therefore quite sufficient to obtain an adequate conception of the moral standards and Religious notions of the Hindus.

It may be said that *Manu Smriti*—and the same is true of the other *Smritis*—is a Code of Laws. It is not a book of Ethics nor is it a book of Religion and to take a book of Laws and to treat it as though it is a book of Ethics and Religion is to confound Ethics, Religion and Law.



In the first place it is only in modern times that Law has been separated from Religion. In all ancient Society, Law and Religion were one. As Prof. Max Muller<sup>1</sup> points out that though :—

“Law seems naturally to be the foundation of society, and the bond that binds a nation together. Those who look below the surface have quickly perceived that law itself, at least ancient law, derives its authority, its force, its very life from religion. . . . The belief that the law giver enjoyed some closer intimacy with the Deity than ordinary mortals, pervades the ancient traditions of many nations. According to a well known passage in Diodorus Siculus, the Egyptians believed their laws to have been communicated to Menvis by Hermes; the Cretans held that Minos received his laws from Zeus, the Lacedaemonians that Lykurgus received his laws from Apollon. According to the Arians, their law giver Zarathustras had received his Laws from the Good Spirit; According to the Stoe, Zamolixis received his laws from the goddess Hestia; and according to the Jews, Moses received his laws from the God Ias.”

No one has pointed out more forcibly than Sir Henry Mains<sup>2</sup> that in ancient times religion as a divine influence was underlying and supporting every relation of life and every social institution when he says of Religion as :

“A supernatural presidency (which) is supposed to consecrate and keep together all the cardinal institutions of those times, the state, the Race, and the Family”.

From this supernatural presidency of Religion, Law had not succeeded in finding an escape until at a later time when law finally breaks away from religion but not without leaving many traces to show the link it had with Religion at the very beginning of human history.

Again it is only in modern times that a difference is being made between Religion and Ethics. Religion and Ethics are inextricably and indissolubly bound together. Morality and Ethics are essentially practical. As Prof. Jacks insists<sup>3</sup> that the problem of Ethics is not merely getting the Good understood but *realised*, not merely getting the Right placed on scientific basis but *done*. Morality is a mere matter of defining what is good and what is right. Prof. Jacks rightly says :

“Whenever we embark on the study of morality without interest in its application I cannot but think that it is not morality we are studying. Morality does not arise till the point of application is reached. The effect of a moral theory launched upon the world is

<sup>1</sup> Science of Religion, pages 150-151.

<sup>2</sup> Ancient Law p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> “Morals and Religion”—Hibbert Journal Vol. XIX. pp. 615-621.

next to nothing unless the application of it can be reinforced by powerful motives. The good life, as Aristotle pointed out is a very difficult affair; difficult even when it goes no further than conformity to existing conventions. But when the good life demands that existing standards must be transcended how can this be effected without an immense liberation of power? Mere information as to why men should do right has no effect against their natural tendencies to do wrong—it is no match for the difficulties that beset good life.”

Unless some motive force comes to its aid morality remains inert. There can be no doubt that what gives motive force to morality is Religion. It is a propelling force which creates, to use again the language of Principal Jacks:

“Motives which are strong enough to overcome the enormous difficulties involved in living the good life, even in its simpler forms, and adequate to maintain that continuous improvement of the moral ideal.”

Religion as a motive force reinforces the moral will in various ways. Sometimes it takes the form of sanctions by laying down a scheme of rewards and punishments after death; some times it makes rules of morality as the commandments of God; some times it invests these rules with sanctity which evokes willing obedience. But these are only different ways in which motive power generated by Religion helps to sustain moral life in action. Religion is the dynamics which moves the wheels of morality.

If Ethics and Morality are duties then there can be no doubt that Manu Smriti is a book of Ethics. Any one who takes the trouble to read the Smriti of Manu will have to admit that if there is any subject which figures prominently in the book it is that of duties. Manu was the first to systematise and codify the duties to which a Hindu was bound. He distinguishes between *Varnashramadharma*s and *Sadharandharma*s. The *Varnashramadharma*s are the specific duties relating to one's station in life i.e. one's station as determined by one's Varna or caste and one's Ashram or particular stage of life. The *Sadharandharma*s are duties irrespective of one's age, caste or creed i.e. duties obligatory on man as man and not as a member of a particular community or social class or as being at a particular stage or period of life. The whole book deals with duties and with nothing else.

Manu Smriti is thus a book of Law, Religion and Ethics rolled into one. It is Ethics because it deals with duties of men. It is religion because it deals with Caste which is the soul of Hinduism. It is Law because it prescribes penalties for breach of duties. In this view there

is nothing wrong in going to Manu Smriti to ascertain the moral standards and religious notions of the Hindus.

That Manu Smriti is a book of Religion may not be quite obvious. That is because Hinduism is a very illusive term. Different writers have defined it in various ways.

Sir D. Ibbetson<sup>1</sup> defines Hinduism as :

“A hereditary sacerdotalism with Brahmins for its devices, the vitality of which is preserved by the social institution of caste and which include all shades and diversities of religion native to India, as distinct from foreign importations of Christianity and Islam, and from the later outgrowths of Buddhism, more doubtfully of Sikhism and still more doubtfully of Jainism”.

Sir J. A. Baines<sup>2</sup> defined Hinduism as :—

“The large residuum that is not Sikh, or Jain, or Buddhist or professedly Animistic, or included in one of the foreign religions such as Islam, Mazdaism, Christianity, or Hebraism.”

To Sir Edward Gait<sup>3</sup> Hinduism :—

“is a complex congenies of creeds and doctrines. It shelters within its portals monotheists, polytheists, and pantheists; Worshippers of the great God Siva and Vishnu, or of their female counterparts, as well as worshippers of the divine mothers, of the spirits of trees, rocks and streams and of the tutelary village deities; persons who propitiate their deity by all matter of bloody sacrifices, and persons who will not only kill no living creature, but who must not even use the word “cut”; those whose ritual consists mainly of prayers and hymns, and those who indulge in unspeakable orgies in the name of religion”.

This discription of complexity is full but is still incomplete. To the list must be added those who revere the cow and those who eat it, those who worship natural forces, and those who worship a single God; those who are worshippers of idols, demons, ghosts, ancestors, saints and heroes.

Such are the answers given by the three Census Commissioners to the simple question what is Hinduism. Others have not found it less difficult to answer the question. Consider how Sir A. Lyall has fared in answering the question. In his “Rede Lecture” delivered at Cambridge in 1891 he said<sup>4</sup> :

“And if I were asked for a definition of Hinduism I could give no precise answer, I could not define it concisely by giving its central

<sup>1</sup> Punjab Census Report 1881, para 214.

<sup>2</sup> Census of India, Report 1881, p. 158.

<sup>3</sup> Census of India, Report 1911 p. 114.

<sup>4</sup> Asiatic Studies Vol.II pp. 287-88.

doctrines and its essential articles of faith; as I might do in describing of the great historical Religions. For the word Hindu is not exclusively a religious denomination; it denotes also a country, and to certain degree a race. When we speak of Christian, a Mahomedan, or a Buddhist, we mean a particular religious community, in the widest sense, without distinction of race or place. When we talk of a Russian or a Persian, we indicate country or parentage without distinction of creed. But when a person tells me that he is a Hindu, I know that he means all three things together—Religion, Parentage and Country.”

Speaking of Hinduism as a Religion Sir Alfred Lyall said that :

“Hindism was a tangled mangle of disorderly superstitions, the collection of rights, worships, beliefs, traditions and mythologies, that are sanctioned by the sacred books and ordinances of the Brahmins and are propagated by Brahmanic teachings.”

Lastly I will quote the definition given by a Hindu Mr. G. P. Sen who not merely a Hindu but is a student of Hinduism. In his book called ‘Introduction to the study of Hinduism’ Mr. Sen says :—

“Hinduism is what the Hindus, or a major portion of them in a Hindu Community do.”

Is there then no principle in Hinduism which all Hindus no matter what their other differences are, feel bound to render willing obedience? It seems to me there is and that principle is the principle of Caste. There may be a difference of opinion as to which matters constitute matters of essence so far as Hinduism is concerned. But there can be no doubt that Caste is one and an essential and integral part of Hinduism. Every Hindu—if he is not merely a statutory Hindu—believes in Caste and every Hindu—even one who prides himself on being a statutory Hindu—has a Caste. A Hindu is as much born into caste as he is born in Hinduism. Indeed a person cannot be born in Hinduism unless he is born in a Caste. Caste and Hinduism are inseparable. As Prof. Max Muller<sup>1</sup> observes :

“Modern Hinduism rests on the system of Caste as on a rock which no arguments can shake.”

It therefore follows that in so far as Manu lays down the creed of the Caste and in so far as Hinduism at its core is the creed of Caste the Manu Smriti must be accepted as the Book of Religion.

## II

What are the Ethical and Religious norms prescribed by Manu for Hindus to observe and follow?

<sup>1</sup> Science of Religion, p. 28.

To begin with, Manu divides Hindus into four varnas or social orders. He not only divides Hindus into four orders he also grades them. The following is his scheme of gradation.

X. 3. On account of his pre-eminence, on account of the superiority of his origin, on account of his observance of (particular) restrictive rules, and on account of his particular sanctification the Brahman is the Lord of (all) Varnas.

He proceeds to amplify his reasons and does so in the following characteristic manner :—

I. 93. As the Brahmana sprang from (Prajapati's i.e. Gods) mouth, as he was first-born, and as he possesses the Veda, he is by right the lord of this whole creation.

I. 94. For the self existent (Svayambhu i.e. God), having performed austerities, produced him first from his own mouth, in order that the offerings might be conveyed to the Gods and Manes and that this universe might be preserved.

I. 95. What created being can surpass him, through whose mouth the Gods continually consume the sacrificial viands and the manes the offerings to the dead.

I. 96. Of created beings the most excellent are said to be those which are animated; of the animated, those who subsist by intelligence; of the intelligent, mankind; and of the men, the Brahmins.

Besides the reason given by Manu the Brahmin is first in rank because he was produced by God from his mouth, in order that the offerings might be conveyed to the Gods and manes. Manu gives another reason for the supremacy of the Brahmins. He says :—

I. 98. The very birth of a Brahmana is an eternal incarnation of the sacred Law (Veda); for he is born to (fulfil) the sacred law, and become one with Brahman (God).

I. 99. A Brahmana, coming into existence, is born as the highest on earth, the lord of all created beings, for the protection of the treasury of the Law.

Manu concludes by saying that :

I. 101. The Brahmana eats but his own food, wears but his own apparel, bestows but his own alms; other mortals subsist through the benevolence of the Brahmana."

Because according to Manu :

I. 100. Whatever exists in the world is the property of the Brahmana; on account of the excellence of his origin the Brahmana is, indeed, entitled to it all.

It is really an understatement to say that according to Manu the Brahman is a lord of all creation. For Manu gives a warning to the effect that :—

IX. 317. A Brahmana, be he ignorant or learned, is a great divinity, just as the fire, whether carried forth (for the performance of a burnt oblation) or not carried forth, is a great divinity.

IX. 319. Thus, though the Brahmans employ themselves in all (sorts) of mean occupations, they must be honoured in every way; (for each of) them is a very great deity.

Being a deity the Brahmin is above law and above the King. Manu directs :—

VII. 37. Let the King, after rising early in the morning, worship Brahmans who are well versed in the threefold sacred science and learned (in polity), and follow their advice

VII. 38. Let him daily worship aged Brahmans who know the Veda and are pure.....

Finally Manu says :

XI. 35. The Brahman is (hereby) declared (to be) the creator (of the world), the punisher, the teacher, (and hence) a benefactor (of all created beings); to him let no man say anything unpropitious, nor use any harsh words.

In the Code of Manu there are rules regarding the different occupations which the different orders are required to follow:

I. 88. To Brahmens he (Swayambhu Manu) assigned the duties of reading the Veda, of teaching it, of sacrificing, of assisting others to sacrifice, of giving alms, if they the rich, and if indigent, of receiving of gifts.

I. 89. To defend the people, to give alms, to sacrifice, to read the Veda, to shun the allurements of sensual gratification, are, in a few words, the duties of a Kshatriya.

I. 90. To keep herds of cattle, to bestow largeness, to sacrifice, to read the scriptures, to carry on trade, to lend at interest, and to cultivate land are prescribed or permitted to a Vaisya.

I. 91. One principal duty the supreme Ruler assigns to a Sudra; namely, to serve the before mentioned classes, without depreciating their worth.

X. 74. Let such Brahmans as are intent on the means of attaining the supreme Godhead, and firm in their own duties, completely perform, in order, the six following acts:

X. 75. Reading the Vedas, the teaching others to read them, sacrificing, and assisting others, to sacrifice, giving to the poor if themselves have enough, and accepting gifts from the virtuous if themselves are poor, are the six prescribed acts of the first born class;

X. 76. But, among those six acts of a Brahmin, three are his means of subsistence; assisting to sacrifice, teaching the Vedas, and receiving gifts from a pure handed giver.

X. 77. Three acts of duty cease with the Brahman, and belong not to the Kshatriya; teaching the Vedas, officiating at a sacrifice, and, thirdly, receiving presents.

X. 78. Those three are also (by the fixed rule of law) forbidden to the Vaisya; since Manu, the Lord of all men, prescribed not those acts to the two classes, military and commercial.

X. 79. The means of subsistence, peculiar to the Kshatriya, are bearing arms, either held for striking or missile, to the Vaisya, merchandize, attending on cattle, and agriculture but with a view to the next life, the duties of both are almsgiving, reading, sacrificing. "

Besides prescribing rank and occupation Manu grants privileges to certain orders and imposes penalties on certain orders.

As to privileges those relating to marriage may be referred to first. Manu says :

III. 12. For the first marriage of the twice born classes, a woman of the same class is recommended but for such as are impelled by inclination to marry again, women in the direct order of the classes are to be preferred :

III. 13. A Sudra woman only must be the wife of a Sudra; she and a Vaisya, of a Vaisya; they two and a Kshatriya, of a Kshatriya; those three and a Brahmani of a Brahman.

Then there are privileges relating to occupations. These privileges stand out quite prominently when Manu deals with the question as to what a person is to do when he is in distress:

X. 81. Yet a Brahmen, unable to subsist by his duties just mentioned, may live by the duty of a soldier; for that is the next in rank.

X. 82. If it be asked, how he must live, should he be unable to get a subsistence by either of those employments; the answer is, he may subsist as a mercantile man, applying himself in person to tillage and attendance on cattle.

X. 83. But a Brahman and a Kshatriya, obliged to subsist by the acts of a Vaisya, must avoid with care, if they can live by keeping herds, the business of tillage, which gives great pain to sentient creatures, and is dependent on the labour of others, as bulls and so forth.

X. 84. Some are of opinion, that agriculture is excellent, but it is a mode of subsistence which the benevolent greatly blame, for the iron mouthed pieces of wood not only wound the earth, but the creatures dwelling in it.

X. 85. If through want of a virtuous livelihood, they cannot follow laudable occupations, they may then gain a competence of wealth by selling commodities usually sold by merchants, avoiding what ought to be avoided.

X. 86. They must avoid selling liquids of all sorts, dressed grain, seeds of tila, stones, salt, cattle, and human creatures.

X. 87. All woven cloth dyed red, cloth made of sana, of cshuma-bark, and of wool, even though not red; fruit, roots, and medicinal plants.

X. 88. Water, iron, poison, flesh-meat, the moon-plant, and perfumes of any sort; milk, honey, butter milk, clarified butter, oil of tila, wax, sugar, and blades of cusa grass;

X. 89. All beasts of the forest, as deer and the like, ravenous beasts, birds, and fish; spirituous liquors, nili, or indigo, and lascha, or lac; and all beasts with uncloven hoofs.

X. 90. But the brahmen-husbandman may at pleasure sell pure tila-seeds for the purpose of holy rites, if he keep them not long with a hope of more gain, and shall have produced them by his own culture.;

X. 91. If he apply seeds of tila to any purpose but food, anointing, and sacred oblations, he shall be plunged, in the shape of a worm, together with his parents, into the ordure of dogs.

X. 92. By selling flesh-meat, lac or salt, a Brahmen immediately sinks low; by selling milk three days, he falls to a level with a Sudra.

X. 93. And by selling the other forbidden commodities with his own free will, he assumes in this world, after seven nights, the nature of a mere Vaisya.

X. 94. Fluid things may, however, be bartered for other fluids, but not salt for anything liquid; so may dressed grain for grain undressed, and tila-seeds for grain in the husk, equal weights or measures being given and taken.

X. 102. The Brahmen having fallen into distress, may receive gifts from any person whatever; for by no sacred rule can it be shown, that absolute purity can be sullied.

X. 103. From interpreting the Veda, from officiating at sacrifices, or from taking presents, though in modes generally disapproved, no sin is committed by priests in distress; for they are as pure as fire or water.

Compare with this what Manu has to say with regard to what the other Varnas can do in an emergency, Manu says :

X. 96. A man of lowest class, who, through covetousness, lives by the acts of the highest, let the king strip of all his wealth and instantly banish.



X. 97. His own office, though defectively performed, is preferable to that of another, though performed completely; for he, who without necessity discharges the duties of another class, immediately forfeits his own.

X. 98. A mercantile man, unable to subsist by his own duties, may descend even to the servile acts of a Sudra, taking care never to do what ought never to be done; but, when he has gained a competence, let him depart from service.

X. 99. A man of fourth class, not finding employment by waiting on the twice born, while his wife and son are tormented with hunger, may subsist by handicrafts.

X. 121. If a Sudra want a subsistence and cannot attend priest, he may serve a Kshatriya; or, if he cannot wait on a soldier by birth, he may gain his livelihood by serving an opulent Vaisya.

X. 122. To him, who serves Brahmens, with a view to a heavenly reward, or even with view to both this life and the next, the union of the word Brahmen with his name of servant will assuredly bring success.

X. 123. Attendance on Brahmens is pronounced the best work of Sudra; whatever else he may perform will comparatively avail him nothing.

X. 124. They must allot him a fit maintenance according to their own circumstances, after considering his ability, his exertions, and the number of those, whom he must provide with nourishment.

X. 125. What remains of their dressed rice must be given to him, and apparel which they have worn, and the refuse of their grain, and their old household furniture.

X. 126. There is no guilt in a man of the servile class who eats leeks and other forbidden vegetables; he must not have the sacred investiture; he has no business with the duty of making oblations to fire and the like, but there is no prohibition against his offering dressed grain as a sacrifice, by way of discharging his own duty.

X. 127. Even Sudras, who were anxious to perform their entire duty, and, knowing what they should perform, imitate the practice of good men in the household sacraments, but without any holy text, except those containing praise and salutations, are so far from sinning, that they acquire just applause.

X. 128. As a Sudra, without injuring another man, performs the lawful acts of the twice-born, even thus, without being censured, he gains exaltation in this world and in the next.

X. 129. No superfluous collection of wealth must be made by a Sudra, even though he has power to make it, since a servile man,

who has amassed riches, becomes proud, and, by his insolence or neglect, gives pain even to Brahmens.

He concludes :—

X. 130. Such, as have been fully declared, are the several duties of the four classes in distress for subsistence, and, if they perform them exactly, they shall attain the highest beatitude.

The privileges to some were not merely social they were also financial, Says Manu :—

VIII. 35. From the man, who shall say with truth, 'This property, which has been kept, belongs to me', the king may take a sixth or twelfth part, for having secured it.

VIII. 36. But he, who shall say so falsely, may be fined either an eighth part of his own property, or else in some small proportion to the value of the goods falsely claimed, a just calculation having been made.

VIII. 37. A learned Brahmen, having found a treasure formerly hidden, may take it without any deduction; since he is the lord of all.

VIII. 38. But of a treasure anciently deposited under ground, which any other subject or the king has discovered, the king may lay up half in his treasury having given half to the Brahmens.

IX. 323. Should the king be near his end through some incurable disease, he must bestow on the priests all his riches, accumulated his kingdom to his son, let him seek death in battle, or if there be no war, by abstaining from food.

VII. 127. Having ascertained the rates of purchase and sale, the length of the way, the expenses of food and of condiments the charges of securing the goods carried, and the net profits of trade, let the king oblige traders to pay taxes on their saleable commodities.

VII. 128. After full consideration, let a king so levy those taxes continually in his dominions, that both he and the merchant may receive a just compensation for their several acts.

VII. 129. As the leech, the suckling calf, and the bee, take their natural food by little and little, thus must a king draw from his dominions an annual revenue.

VII. 130. Of cattle, of gems, of gold and silver, added each year to the capital stock, a fiftieth part may be taken by the king; of grain, an eighth part, a sixth, or a twelfth, according to the difference of the soil, and the labour necessary to cultivate it.

VII. 131. He may also take a sixth part of the clear annual increase of trees, fleshmeat, honey, clarified butter, perfumes, medical substances, liquids, flowers, roots, and fruit.

VII. 132. Of gathered leaves, pot-herbs, grass, utensils made with leather or cane, earthen pots, and all things made of stone.

VII. 132. A king, even though dying with want, must not receive any tax from a Brahman learned in the Vedas, nor suffer such a Brahman, residing in his territories, to be afflicted with hunger.

VII. 134. Of that king, in whose dominion a learned Brahman is afflicted with hunger, the whole kingdom will in a short time be afflicted with famine.

VII. 137. Let the king order a mere trifle to be paid, in the name of the annual tax, by the meaner inhabitants of his realm, who subsist by petty traffic.

VII. 138. By low handicraftsmen, artificers, and servile men, who support themselves by labour, the king may cause work to be done for a day in each month.

VIII. 394. Neither a blind man, nor an idiot, nor a cripple, nor a man full seventy years old, nor one who confers great benefits on priests of eminent learning, shall be compelled by any king to pay taxes.

X. 118. A military king, who takes even a fourth part of the crops of his realm at a time of urgent necessity, as of war or invasion, and protects his people to the utmost of his power, commits no sin:

X. 119. His peculiar duty is conquest, and he must not recede from battle; so that, while he defends by his arms the merchant and husbandman, he may levy the legal tax as the price of protection.

X. 120. The tax on the mercantile class, which in times of prosperity must be only a twelfth part of their crops, and a fiftieth of their personal profits, may be an eighth of their crops in a time of distress, or a sixth, which is the medium, or even a fourth in great public adversity; but a twentieth of their gains on money, and other moveables, is the highest tax; serving men, artisans, and mechanics, must assist by their labour, but at no time pay taxes.

X. 187. To the nearest sapinda, male or female, after him in the third degree, the inheritance next belongs; then, on failure of sapindas and of their issue the samanodaca, or distant kinsman, shall be the heir; or the spiritual preceptor, or the pupil, or the fellow student, of the deceased.

IX. 188. On failure of all those, the lawful heirs are such Brahmens, as have read the three Vedas, as are pure in body and mind, as have subdued their passions; and they must consequently offer the cake; thus the rites of obsequies cannot fail.

IX. 189. The property of a Brahmen shall never be taken as an escheat by the king; this is a fixed law; but the wealth of the other classes, on failure of all heirs, the king may take.

The terms on which the different social orders should carry on their associated life has been defined by Manu in a set of rules which form a very important part of the morals of the Hindu House.

Manu ordains that:

X. 3. From priority of birth, from superiority of origin, from a more exact knowledge of scripture, and from a distinction in the sacrificial thread, the Brahmen is the lord of all classes.

IX. 317. A Brahmen, whether learned or ignorant, is a powerful divinity; even as fire is powerful divinity, whether consecrated or popular.

IX. 319. Thus, although Brahmens employ themselves in all sorts of mean occupations, they must invariably be honoured; for they are something transcendently divine.

VII. 35. A king was created as the protector of all those classes and orders, who, from the first to the last, discharge their several duties.

VII. 36. And all, that must be done by him, for the protection of his people, with the assistance of good ministers, I will declare to you, as the law directs, in due order.

VII. 37. Let the king, having risen at early dawn, respectfully attend to Brahmen, learned in the three Vedas, and in the science of ethics, and by their decision let him abide.

VII. 38. Constantly must he show respect to Brahmens, who have grown old, both in years and in piety, who know the scriptures, who in body and mind are pure; for he, who honours the aged, will perpetually be honoured even by cruel demons:

IX. 313. Let him not, although in the greatest distress for money, provoke Brahmens to anger by taking their property; for they, once enraged, could immediately by sacrifices and imprecations destroy him with his troops, elephants, horses and cars.

Such was to be the relationship in the field of political life. For ordinary social intercourse between the different Varnas Manu lays down the following rules:—

III. 68. A house-keeper has five places of slaughter, or where small living creatures may be slain; his kitchen-hearth, his grindstone, his broom, his pestle and mortar, his water-pot; by using which, he becomes in bondage to sin:

III. 69. For the sake of expiating offences committed ignorantly in those places mentioned in order, the five great sacraments were appointed by eminent sages to be performed each day by such as keep house.

III. 70. Teaching and studying the scripture is the sacrament of the Veda; offering cakes and water, the sacrament of the Manes, an oblation to fire, the sacrament of the Deities; giving rice or other food to living creatures, the sacrament of spirits; receiving guests with honour, the sacrament of men.

III. 71. Whoever omits not those five great ceremonies, if he have ability to perform them, is untainted by the sons of the five slaughtering places, even though he constantly reside at home;

III. 84. In his domestic fire for dressing the food of all the Gods, after the prescribed ceremony, let a Brahmen make an oblation each day to these following divinities.

After it is offered to the deities Manu directs:—

III. 92. The share of dogs, of outcasts, of dog-feeders, of sinful men, punished with elephantiasis or consumption, of crows, and of reptiles, let him drop on the ground by little and little.

With regard to the rules of hospitality Manu directs the householder:

III. 102. A Brahmen, staying but one night as a guest, is called an atithi, since continuing so short a time, he is not even a sojourner for a whole tithi, or day of the moon.

III. 98. But an offering in the fire of a sacerdotal mouth, which richly blazes with true knowledge and piety, will release the giver from distress and even from deadly sin.

III. 107. To the highest guests in the best form, to the lowest in the worst, to the equal equally, let him offer seats, resting places, couches; giving them proportionable attendance when they depart; and honour, as long as they stay.

III. 110. A military man is not denominated a guest in the house of a Brahman; nor a man of the commercial or servile class; nor his familiar friend, nor his paternal kinsmen; nor his preceptor.

III. 111. But if a warrior come to his house in the form of a guest, let food be prepared for him, according to his desire, after the beforementioned Brahmens have eaten.

III. 112. Even to a merchant or a labourer, approaching his house in the manner of guests, let him give food, showing marks of benevolence at the same time with his domestics.

On social bearing of one class towards another Manu has laid down some very interesting ordinances. He has an equation for social status:

II. 135. The student must consider a Brahmen, though but ten years old, and a Kshatriya, though aged a hundred years, as father and son; as between those two, the young Brahmen is to be respected as the father.

II. 136. Wealth, kindred, age, moral conduct, and, fifthly divine knowledge, entitle men to respect; but that which is last mentioned in order, is the most respectable.

II. 137. Whatever man of the three highest classes possesses the most of those five, both in number and degree that man is entitled to most respect; even a Sudra, if he have entered the tenth decade of his age.

II. 138. Way must be made for a man in a wheeled carriage, or above ninety years old, or afflicted with disease, or carrying a burthen; for a woman; for a priest just returned from the mansion of his preceptor; for a prince, and for a bridegroom.

II. 139. Among all those, if they be met at one time, the priest just returned home and the prince are most to be honoured; and of those two, the priest just returned, should be treated with more respect than the prince.

As illustrating the rules of social bearing a reference may be made to rules regarding salutation:

II. 121. A youth who habitually greets and constantly reverses the aged, obtains an increase of four things; life, knowledge, fame, strength.

II. 122. After the word of salutation, a Brahman must address an elder; saying, "I am such an one," pronouncing his own name.

II. 123. If any persons, through ignorance of the Sanskrit language, understand not the import of his name, to them should a learned man say, "It is I"; and in that manner he should address all classes of women.

II. 124. In the salutation he should pronounce, after his own name, the vocative particle 'bhoh'; for the particle 'bhoh' is held by the wise to have the same property with names fully expressed.

II. 125. A Brahmen should thus be saluted in return; "May'st thou live long, excellent man", and at the end of his name, the vowel and preceding consonant should be lengthened, with an acute accent, to three syllabic moments or short vowels.

II. 126. That Brahmen, who knows not the form of returning a salutation, must not be saluted by a man of learning; as a Shudra, even so is he.

II. 127. Let a learned man ask a priest, when he meets him, if his devotion prospers, a warrior, if he is unhurt; a merchant, if his wealth

is secure; and one of the servile classes, if he enjoys good health; using respectively the words, cusalam, anamayam, ksheman and anarogyam.

The provisions laid down by Manu in relation to Religion and Religious Sacraments and Sacrifice are worthy of note.

The ordinances of Manu relating to Sacraments and sacrifices are as follows:

III. 68. A house-keeper has five places of slaughter, or where small living creatures may be slain; his kitchen-hearth, his grindstone, his broom, his pastle and mortar, his water-pot; by using which, he become in bondage to sin.

III. 69. For the sake of expiating offences committed ignorantly in those places mentioned in order, the five great sacraments were appointed by eminent sages to be performed each day by such as keep house.

III. 70. Teaching and studying the scriptures is the sacrament of the Veda; offering cakes and water, the sacrament of the Manes, an oblation to fire, the sacrament of the Deities; giving rice or other food to living creatures, the sacraments of spirits; receiving guests with honour, the sacrament of men.

III. 71. Whoever omits not those five great ceremonies, if he have ability to perform them, is untainted by the sons of the five slaughtering places, even though he constantly reside at home.

Manu then proceeds to lay down that all are not entitled to the benefit of the sacraments and all have not the same right to perform the sacrifices.

He defines the position of women and Shudras in the matter of Sacraments and sacrifices. As to women Manu says :—

II. 66. The same ceremonies, except that of the sacrificial thread, must be duly performed for women at the same age and in the same order, that the body may be made perfect; but without any text from the Veda. ”

As to Shudras, Manu says :—

X. 127. Even Shudras, who were anxious to perform their entire duty, and, knowing what they should perform imitate the practice of good men in the household sacraments, but without any holy text, except those containing praise and salutation, are so far from sinning, that they acquire just applause.

The investiture of a person with the sacred thread is a very important sacrament.

II. 36. In the eighth year from the conception of a Brahman, in the eleventh from that of a Kshatriya, and in the twelfth from that of a Vaisya, let the father invest the child with the mark of his class.

II. 37. Should a Brahman, or his father for him, be desirous of his advancement in sacred knowledge; a Kshatriya, of extending his power; or a Vaisya of engaging in mercantile business; the investiture may be made in the fifth, sixth, or eighth years respectively.

II. 38. The ceremony of investiture hallowed by the Gayatri must not be delayed, in the case of a priest, beyond the sixteenth year; nor in that of a soldier, beyond the twenty second; nor in that of a merchant, beyond the twenty fourth.

II. 39. After that, all youths of these three classes, who have not been invested at the proper time, become vratyas, or outcasts, degraded from the Gayatri, and condemned by the virtuous.

As to the *Gayatri* it is a *mantra* and this is how Manu explains its importance:—

II. 76. Brahma milked out, as it were, from the three Vedas, the letter A, the letter U, and the letter M which form by their coalition the trilateral monosyllable, together with three mysterious words *bhur*, *bhuvah*, *svah*. or earth, sky, heaven.

II. 77. From the three Vedas, also, the Lord of creatures, incomprehensibly exalted, successively milked out the three measures of that ineffable text, beginning with the word *tad*, and entitled *Savitri* or *Gayatri*.

II. 78. A priest who shall know the Veda, and shall pronounce to himself, both morning and evening, that syllable, and that holy text preceded by the three words, shall attain the sanctity which the Veda confers :

II. 79. And a twice born man, who shall a thousand times repeat those three (*om*, the *vyahritis*, and the *gayatri*), apart from the multitude, shall be released in a month even from a great offence, as a snake from his slough.

II. 80. The priest, the soldier, and the merchant, who shall neglect this mysterious text, and fail to perform in due season his peculiar acts of piety, shall meet with contempt among the virtuous.

II. 81. The great immutable words, preceded by the trilateral syllable, and followed by the *gayatri* which consists of three measures, must be considered as the mouth, or principal part of the Veda;

II. 82. Whoever shall repeat, day by day, for three years, without negligence, that sacred text, shall hereafter approach the divine essence, move as freely as air, and assume an ethereal form.

II. 83. The trilateral monosyllable is an emblem of the Supreme, the suppressions of breath with a mind fixed on God are the highest



devotion; but nothing is more exalted than the Gayatri; a declaration of truth is more excellent than silence.

II. 84. All rites ordained in the Veda, oblations to fire, and solemn sacrifices pass away; but that which passes not away, is declared to be the syllable om, thence called acshara; since it is a symbol of God, the Lord of created beings.

II. 85. The act of repeating his Holy Name is ten times better than the appointed sacrifice; an hundred times better when it is heard by no man; and a thousand times better when it is purely mental.

II. 86. The four domestic sacraments which are accompanied with the appointed sacrifice, are not equal though all be united, to a sixteenth part of the sacrifice performed by a repetition of the gayatri.

This investiture is equivalent to a new birth.

II. 147. Let a man consider that as a mere human birth, which his parents gave him for their mutual gratification, and which he receives after lying in the womb.

II. 148. But that birth which his principal acharya, who knows the whole Veda, procures for him by his divine mother the gayatri, is a true birth; that birth is exempt from age and from death.

II. 169. The first birth is from a natural mother; the second, from the ligation of the zone; the third from the due performance of the sacrifice; such are the births of him who is usually called twice-born, according to a text of the Veda.

II. 170. Among them his divine birth is that, which is distinguished by the ligation of the zone, and sacrificial cord; and in that birth the Gayatri is his mother, and the Acharya, his father. This sacrament is not permitted by Manu to Shudras and to women.

II. 103. But he who stands not repeating it in the morning, and sits not repeating it in the evening, must be precluded, like a Sudra, from every sacred observance of the twice born class.

Manu has not forgotten to mention rules relating to education and earning. Manu has nothing to say about mass education. He does not see the utility of it and he does not see the necessity of imposing any obligation upon the king or the state. He was merely concerned with the learning of the sacred and Religious literature namely the Vedas.

Veda must be learned from a preceptor and with his assent. No one can read and study the Vedas by himself. He will be guilty of theft if he did it.

II. 116. He who shall acquire knowledge of the Veda without the assent of his preceptor, incurs the guilt of stealing the scripture and shall sink to the region of torment.

But others cannot study at all.

IX. 18. Women have no business with the texts of the Veda; thus is the law fully settled; having, therefore, no evidence of law, and no knowledge of expiatory texts, sinful women must be as foul as falsehood itself; and this is a fixed rule.

IV. 99. He must never read the Veda without accents and letters well pronounced; nor even in the presence of Sudras; nor, having begun to read it in the last watch of the night, must he, though fatigued, sleep again.

This prohibition applies to *Vratyas* or outcasts from the three higher classes. For Manu says:

II. 40. With such impure men, let no Brahmen, even in distress for subsistence, ever form a connexion in law, either by the study of the Veda, or by affinity.

Teaching Veda or performing of sacrifices for disqualified persons was prohibited by Manu.

IV. 205. Never let a priest eat part of a sacrifice not begun with texts of the Veda, nor of one performed by a common sacrificer, by a woman, or by an eunuch:

IV. 206. When those persons offer the clarified butter, it brings misfortune to good men, and raises aversion in the deities, such oblations, therefore, he must carefully shun.

XI. 198. He, who has officiated at a sacrifice for outcasts, or burned the corpse of a stranger, or performed rites to destroy the innocent, or made the impure sacrifice, called *Ahimsa*, may expiate his guilt by three *prajapatya* penances.

Take equality before Law.

When they come as witnesses—according to Manu they are to be sworn as follows:

VIII. 87. In the forenoon let the judge, being purified, severally call on the twice-born, being purified also, to declare the truth, in the presence of some image, a symbol of the divinity, and of Brahmens, while the witnesses turn their faces either to the north or to the east.

VIII. 88. To a Brahmen he must begin with saying, "Declare;" to a Kshatriya, with saying, "Declare the truth"; to a Vaisya, with comparing perjury to the crime of stealing kine, grain, or gold; to a Sudra, with comparing it in some or all of the following sentences, to every crime that men can commit.

VIII. 113. Let the judge cause a priest to swear by his veracity; a soldier, by his horse, or elephant, and his weapons; a merchant, by his kine, grain, and gold; a mechanic or servile man, by imprecating on his own head, if he speak falsely, all possible crime; Manu also deals with cases of witnesses giving false evidence. According to Manu giving false evidence is a crime. Says Manu:

VIII. 122. Learned men have specified these punishments, which were ordained by sage legislators for perjured witnesses, with a view to prevent a failure of justice and to restrain iniquity.

VIII. 123. Let a just prince banish men of the three lower classes, if they give false evidence having first levied the fine; but a Brahmen let him only banish."

But Manu made one exception:

VIII. 112. To women, however, at a time of dalliance, or on a proposal of marriage, in the case of grass or fruit eaten by a cow, of wood taken for a sacrifice, or of a promise made for the preservation of a Brahmen, it is deadly sin to take a light oath. As parties to proceedings—Their position can be illustrated by quoting the ordinances of Manu relating to a few of the important criminal offences dealt with by Manu.

Take the offence of Defamation. Manu says:

VIII. 267. A soldier, defaming a priest, shall be fined a hundred panas a merchant, thus offending, an hundred and fifty, or two hundred: but, for such an offence, a mechanic or servile man shall be whipped.

VIII. 268. A priest shall be fined fifty, if he slander a soldier; twenty five, if a merchant; and twelve, if he slander a man of the servile class.

Take the offence of Insult—Manu says:

VIII. 270. A once-born man, who insults the twice-born with gross invectives, ought to have his tongue slit; for he sprang from the lowest part of Brahma.

VIII. 271. If he mention their names and classes with contumely as, if he say, "Oh Devadatta, thou refuse of Brahmen", an iron style, ten fingers long, shall be thrust red into his mouth.

VIII. 272. Should he, through pride, give instruction to priests concerning their duty, let the king order some hot oil to be dropped into his mouth and his ear.

Take the offence of Abuse—Manu says:

VIII. 276. For mutual abuse by a priest and a soldier, this fine must be imposed by a learned king; the lowest amercement on the priest, and the middle-most on the soldier.

VIII. 277. Such exactly, as before mentioned, must be the punishment for a merchant and a mechanic, in respect of their several classes, except the slitting of the tongue; this is a fixed rule of punishment.

Take the offence of Assault—Manu propounds:

VIII. 279. With whatever member of a low-born man shall assault or hurt a superior, even that member of his must be slit, or cut more or less in proportion to the injury; this an ordinance of Manu.

VIII. 280. He who raises his hand or a staff against another, shall have his hand cut; and he, who kicks another in wrath, shall have an incision made in his foot.

Take the offence of Arrogance—According to Manu:

VIII. 281. A man of the lowest class, who shall insolently place himself on the same seat with one of the highest, shall either be banished with a mark on his hinder parts, or the king shall cause a gash to be made on his buttock.

VIII. 282. Should he spit on him through pride, the king shall order both his lips to be gashed; should he urinate on him, his penis; should he break wind against him, his anus.

VIII. 283. If he seize the Brahmen by the locks, or by the feet, or by the beard, or by the throat, or by the scrotum, let the king without hesitation cause incisions to be made in his hands.

Take the offence of Adultery. Says Manu:

VIII. 359. A man of the servile class, who commits actual adultery with the wife of a priest, ought to suffer death; the wives, indeed, of all the four classes must ever be most especially guarded.

VIII. 366. A low man, who makes love to a damsel of high birth, ought to be punished corporally; but he who addresses a maid of equal rank, shall give the nuptial present and marry her, if her father please.

VIII. 374. A mechanic or servile man, having an adulterious connection with a woman of a twice-born class, whether guarded at home or unguarded, shall thus be punished; if she was unguarded, he shall lose the part offending, and his whole substance; if guarded, and a priestless, every thing, even his life.

VIII. 375. For adultery with a guarded priestess, a merchant shall forfeit all his wealth after imprisonment for a year; a soldier shall be fined a thousand panas, and be shaved with the urine of an ass.

VIII. 376. But, if a merchant or soldier commit adultery with a woman of the sacerdotal class, whom her husband guards not at

home, the king shall only fine the merchant five hundred, and the soldier a thousand;

VIII. 377. Both of them, however, if they commit that offence with a priestess not only guarded but eminent for good qualities, shall be punished like men of the servile class, or be burned in a fire of dry grass or reeds.

VIII. 382. If a merchant converse criminally with a guarded woman of the military, or a soldier with one of the mercantile class, they both deserve the same punishment as in the case of a priestess unguarded.

VIII. 383. But a Brahmen, who shall commit dultery with a guarded woman of those two classes, must be fined a thousand panas; and for the like offence with a guarded woman of the servile class, the fine of a soldier or a merchant shall be also one thousand.

VIII. 384. For adultery with a woman of the military class, if unguarded, the fine of a merchant is five hundred; but a soldier, for the converse of that offence, must be shaved with urine, or pay the fine just mentioned.

VIII. 385. A priest shall pay five hundred panas if he connect himself criminally with an unguarded woman of the military, commercial, or servile class, and a thousand, for such a connexion with a woman of vile mixed breed.

Turning to the system of punishment for offences Manu's Scheme throws an interesting light on the subject. Consider the following ordinances:

VIII. 379. Ignominious tonsure is ordained, instead of capital punishment, for an adulterer of the priestly class, where the punishment of other classes may extend to loss of life.

VIII. 380. Never shall the king slay a Brahmen, though convicted of all possible crimes; let him banish the offender from his realm, but with all his property secure, and his body unhurt.

XI. 127. For killing intentionally a virtuous man of the military class, the penance must a fourth part of that ordained for killing a priest; for killing a Vaisya, only an eighth; for killing a Sudra, who had been constant in discharging his duties, a sixteenth part.

XI. 128. But, if a Brahmen kill a Kshatriya without malice, he must, after a full performance of his religious rites, give the priests one bull together with a thousand cows.

XI. 129. Or he may perform for three years the penance for slaying a Brahmen, mortifying his organs of sensation and action, letting his hair grow long, and living remote from the town, with the root of a tree for his mansion.

XI. 130. If he kill without malice a Vaisya, who had a good moral character, he may perform the same penance for one year, or give the priests a hundred cows and a bull.

XI. 131. For six months must he perform this whole penance, if without intention he kill a Sudra; or he may give ten white cows and a bull to the priests.

VIII. 381. No greater crime is known on earth than slaying a Brahmen; and the king, therefore, must not even form in his mind an idea of killing a priest.

VIII. 126. Let the king having considered and ascertained the frequency of a similar offence, the place and time, the ability of the criminal to pay or suffer and the crime itself, cause punishment to fall on those alone, who deserve it.

VIII. 124. Manu, son of the Self-existent, has named ten places of punishment, which are appropriate to the three lower classes, but a Brahmen must depart from the realm unhurt in any one of them.

VIII. 125. The part of generation, the belly, the tongue, the two hands, and, fifthly, the two feet, the eye, the nose, both ears, the property, and, in a capital case, the whole body.

On the point of rights and duties relating to religious Sacraments and Sacrifices the views of Manu are noteworthy:

II. 28. By studying the Veda, by religious observances, by oblations to fire, by the ceremony of Traividya, by offering to the Gods and Manes, by the procreation of children, by the five great sacraments, and by solemn sacrifices, this human body is rendered fit for a divine state.

III. 69. For the sake of expiating offences committed ignorantly in those places mentioned in order, the five great sacraments were appointed by eminent sages to be performed each day by such as keep house.

III. 70. Teaching and studying the scripture is the sacrament of the Veda; offering cakes and water, the sacrament of the Manes; an oblation to fire, the sacrament of the Deities; giving rice or other food to living creatures, the sacrament of spirits; receiving guests with honour, the sacrament of men.

III. 71. Whoever omits not those five great ceremonies, if he have ability to perform them, is untainted by the sins of the five slaughtering places, even though he constantly reside at home.

Such are the ordinances of Manu. Laws are never complete enough to cover every point. There are always moot questions. Manu was conscious of this and provides for such contingencies.

XII. 108. If it be asked, how the law shall be ascertained, when particular cases are not comprised under any of the general rules, the answer is this: "That which well instructed Brahmens propound, shall be held incontestible law."

XII. 109. Well instructed Brahmens are they, who can adduce ocular proof from the scripture itself, having studied, as the law ordains, the Vedas and their extended branches, or Vedangas, Mimansa, Nyaya, Dharma, Shastra, Puranas.

XII. 113. Even the decision of one priest, if more cannot be assembled, who perfectly knows the principles of the Vedas, must be considered as law of the highest authority; not the opinion of myriads, who have no sacred knowledge.

The Laws of Manu are eternal. Therefore there is no question of considering how changes could be effected in them. The only question Manu had to consider was the upholding and maintaining the system. Manu has laid down several provisions with this purpose in view.

As to the preservation of the Social Code, Manu has made it the duty of the King to uphold and maintain:

VIII. 410. The king should order each man of the mercantile class to practice trade, or money lending, or agriculture and attendance on cattle; and each man of the servile class to act in the service of the twice-born.

VIII. 418. With vigilant care should the king exert himself in compelling merchants and mechanics to perform their respective duties; for, when such men swerve from their duty, they throw this world into confusion.

Failure to maintain was made an offence in the King punishable at Law.

VIII. 335. Neither a father, nor a preceptor, nor a friend, nor a mother, nor a wife, nor a son, nor a domestic priest must be left unpunished by the king, if they adhere not with firmness to their duty.

VIII. 336. Where another man of lower birth would be fined one pana, the king shall be fined a thousand, and he shall give the fine to the priests, or cast it into the river, this is a sacred rule.

Failure to uphold and maintain the system on the part of the king involved a forfeiture of his right to rule. For Manu allows a right to rebel against such a King.

VIII. 348. The twice-born may take arms, when their duty is obstructed by force; and when, in some evil time, a disaster has befallen the twice-born classes.

The right of rebellion is given to the three higher classes and not to the Shudra. This is very natural. Because it is only the three upper classes who would benefit by the maintenance of this system. But supposing the Kshatriyas joined the King in destroying the system what is to be done? Manu gives the authority to the Brahmins to punish all and particularly the Kshatriyas.

XI. 31. A priest, who well knows the laws, need not complain to the king of any grievous injury; since, even by his own power, he may chastise those, who injure him.

XI. 32. His own power, which depends on himself alone, is mightier than the royal power, which depends on other men; by his own might, therefore, may a Brahman coerce his foes.

XI. 33. He may use, without hesitation, the powerful charms revealed to Atharvan, and by him to Angiras; for speech is the weapon of a Brahmen; with that he may destroy his oppressors.

IX. 320. Of a military man, who raises his arm violently on all occasions against the priestly class, the priest himself shall be the chastiser; since the soldier originally proceeded from the Brahmen." How can the Brahmins punish the Kshatriyas unless they can take arms? Manu knows this and therefore allows the Brahmins to arm themselves to punish the Kshatriyas.

XII. 100. Command of armies, royal authority, power of inflicting punishment, and sovereign dominion over all nations, he only well deserves, who perfectly understands the Veda Shastra.

So intent is Manu on the maintenance of the system of Chaturvarna that he did not hesitate to make this fundamental change in it. For to ask a Brahman to take up arms is a fundamental change as compared with the rule that was prevalent before Manu. The prohibition against Brahmin handling arms was very strict. In the Apastamba Dharma Sutras which is prior to Manu the rule is laid down in the following terms:

I. 10, 29, 6. A Brahmin shall not take up a weapon in his hand though he be only desirous of examining it."

Successor of Manu—Baudhayana—improved upon him, and laid down in his Code of Laws:

II. 24, 18. For the protection of the Cows, Brahmins, or in the case of the confusion of Varnas, Brahmins and Vaisyas (also) should take up arms, out of consideration for the Dharma. and maintain the system at any cost.



## CHAPTER 13

### Essays on the Bhagwat Gita : Philosophic Defence of Counter-Revolution : Krishna and His Gita

*The first page of 'Essays on the Bhagvat Gita' is autographed by Dr. Ambedkar. Next 42 pages consist of analytical notes on Virat Parva and Uddiyog Parva including the table of contents on this subject. The table of contents is printed in the schemes. This file contains two typed copies of an essay entitled 'Philosophic Defence of Counter-Revolution—Krishna and His Gita'. The last sentence of this essay is left incomplete. The total number of typed pages of this essay is 40 only. The notes on Virat Parva & Udyog Parva are printed in the next chapters.—Editors.*

What is the place of the Bhagwat Gita in the literature of ancient India? Is it a gospel of the Hindu Religion in the same way as the Bible is of the Christian Religion? The Hindus have come to regard it as their gospel. If it is a gospel, what does it really teach? What is the doctrine it stands for? The variety of answers given to this question by students competent to speak on the subject is really bewildering. Bohtlingk<sup>1</sup> says:

“The Gita contains by the side of many high and beautiful thoughts, not only a few weak points; contradictions (which the commentators have tried to pass over as excusable), repetitions, exaggerations, absurdities and loathsome points.”

“Hopkins<sup>2</sup> speaks of the Bhagwat Gita as a characteristic work of the Hindu Literature in its sublimity as in its puerilities, in its logic as in its want of it; ..... an ill-assorted cabinet of primitive philosophical opinions.”

In his judgment:

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Garbe in his Introduction to the Bhagwat Gita (Indian Antiquary 1918 Supplement).

<sup>2</sup> Religion of India pp. 390-400.

“Despite its occasional power and music exaltation, the Divine song in its present state as a poetical production is unsatisfactory. The same thing is said over again, and the contradictions in phraseology and in meaning are as numerous as the repetitions, so that one is not surprised to find it described as “the wonderful song, which causes the hair to stand on end.”

Holtzman<sup>1</sup> says:

“We have before us (in the Bhagvat Gita) a Vishnuite revision of a pantheistic poem.”

Garbe<sup>2</sup> observes:

“The whole character of the poem in its design and execution is preponderatingly theistic. A personal God Krishna stands forth in the form of a human hero, expounds his doctrine, enjoins, above all things, on his listener, along with the performance of his duties, loving faith in Him and self-surrender:..... And by the side of this God—who is) delineated as personally as possible, and who dominates the whole poem—stands out frequently the impersonal neutral Brahman, the Absolute, as the highest principle. At one time Krishna says that He is the sole Highest God who has created the world and all beings and rules over it all; at another time, he expounds the Vedantic doctrine of Brahman and *maya*—the Cosmic Illusion, and expounds as the highest goal of human being that he be freed from the World-Illusion and become Brahman. These two doctrines—the theistic and the pantheistic—are mixed up with each other, and follow each other, sometimes quite unconnected and sometimes loosely connected. And it is not the case that the one is represented as a lower, exoteric, (Text p. 9) and, (p. ) as the higher esoteric doctrine. It is nowhere taught that the Theism is a preliminary step to the knowledge of the reality or that it is its symbol, and that the pantheism of the Vedanta is the (ultimate) reality itself; but the two beliefs are treated of almost throughout as though there was indeed no difference between them, either verbal or real.”

Mr. Telang says:<sup>3</sup>

“There are several passages in the Gita which it is not very easy to reconcile with one another; and no attempt is made to harmonise them. Thus, for example, in stanza 16 of Chapter VII, Krishna divides his devotees into four classes, one of which consists of ‘men of knowledge’, whom, Krishna says, he considers ‘as his own self’. It would probably be difficult to imagine any expression which

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Garbe.

<sup>2</sup> Introduction to Bhagvat Gita.

<sup>3</sup> Bhagvat Gita (S.E.B.) Introduction p. 11.

could indicate higher esteem. Yet in stanza 46 of chapter VI, we have it laid down, that the devotee is superior not only to the mere performer of penances, but even to the men of knowledge. The commentators betray their gnostic bias by interpreting 'men of knowledge' in this latter passage to mean those who have acquired erudition in the Shastras and their significations. This is not an interpretation to be necessarily rejected. But there is in it a certain twisting of words, which, under the circumstances here, I am not inclined to accept. And on the other hand, it must not be forgotten, that the implications fairly derivable from Chapter IV, stanza 39 (pp. 62, 63), would seem to be rather than knowledge is superior to devotion—is the higher stage to be reached by means of devotion as the stepping stone. In another passage again at Gita, Chapter XII, stanza 12, concentration is preferred to knowledge, which also seems to me to be irreconcilable with Chapter VII, stanza 16. Take still another instance. At Gita, Chapter B stanza 15, it is said, that 'Lord receives the sin or merit of none.' Yet at Chapter V, stanza 24 Krishna calls himself 'the Lord and enjoyer,' of all sacrifices and penances. How, it may be well asked, can the Supreme Being 'enjoy that which he does not even receive?' Once more at Chapter X, stanza 29, Krishna declares that 'none is hateful to me, none dear.' And yet the remarkable verse at the close of Chapter XII seem to stand in pointblank contradiction to that declaration. There through a most elaborate series of stanzas, the burden of Krishna's eloquent sermon is 'such a one is dear to me.' And again in those fine verses, where Krishna winds up his Divine Law, he similarly tells Arjuna, that he, Arjuna, is 'dear' to Krishna. And Krishna also speaks of that devotee as 'dear' to him, who may publish the mystery of the Gita among those who references Supreme Being.<sup>1</sup> And yet again, how are we to reconcile the same passage about none being 'hateful or dear' to Krishna, with his own words at Chapter XVI, stanza 18 and following stanzas? The language used in describing the 'demoniac' people there mentioned is not remarkable for sweetness towards them, while Krishna says positively, 'I hurl down such people into demoniac wombs, whereby they go down into misery and the vilest condition.' These persons are scarcely characterized with accuracy 'as neither hateful nor dear' to Krishna. It seems to me, that all these are real inconsistencies in the Gita, not such, perhaps, as might not be explained away, but such, I think, as indicate a mind making guesses at truth, as Professor Max Muller puts it, rather than a mind elaborating a complete and organized

<sup>1</sup> And see, too, Chapter VII, stanza 17, where the man of knowledge is declared to be 'dear' to Krishna.

system of philosophy. There is not even a trace of consciousness on the part of the author that these inconsistencies exist. And the contexts of the various passages indicate, in my judgment, that a half-truth is struck out here and another half-truth there, with special reference to the special subject then under discussion; but no attempt is made to organize the various half-truths which are apparently incompatible, into a symmetrical whole, where the apparent inconsistencies might possibly vanish altogether in the higher synthesis."

These are the views of what might be called modern scholars. Turning to the view of the orthodox Pandits, we again find a variety of views. One view is that the Bhagvat is not a sectarian book. It pays equal respect to the three ways of salvation (1) Karma marga or the path of works (2) Bhakti marga or the path of devotion and (3) Jnana marga or the path of knowledge and preaches the efficacy of all three as means of salvation. In support of their contention that the Gita respects all the three ways of salvation and accepts the efficacy of each one of them, the Pandits point out that of the 18 Chapters of the Bhagvat Gita, Chapters 1 to 6 are devoted to the preaching of the Jnana marga, Chapters 7 to 12 to the preaching of Karma marga and Chapters 12 to 18 to the preaching of Bhakti marga and say that this equal distribution of its Chapters shows that the Gita upholds all the three modes of salvation.

Quite contrary to the view of the Pandits is the view of Shankaracharya and Mr. Tilak, both of whom must be classed amongst orthodox writers. Shankaracharya held the view that the Bhagvat Gita preached that the Jnana marga was the only true way of salvation. Mr. Tilak<sup>1</sup> does not agree with the views of any of the other scholars. He repudiates the view that the Gita is a bundle of inconsistencies. He does not agree with the Pandits who say that the Bhagvat Gita recognizes all the three ways of salvation. Like Shankaracharya he insists that the Bhagvat Gita has a definite doctrine to preach. But he differs from Shankaracharya and holds that the Gita teaches Karma Yoga and not Jnana Yoga.

It cannot but be a matter of great surprise to find such a variety of opinion as to the message which the Bhagvat Gita preaches. One is forced to ask why there should be such divergence of opinion among scholars? My answer to this question is that scholars have gone on a false errand. They have gone on a search for the message of the Bhagvat Gita on the assumption that it is a gospel as the Koran, the Bible or the Dhammapada is. In my opinion this assumption is quite

<sup>1</sup> See His Gita Rahasya (2nd edition) vol. II, Chapter XIV, *passim*.

a false assumption. The Bhagvat Gita is not a gospel and it can therefore have no message and it is futile to search for one. The question will no doubt be asked : What is the Bhagvat Gita if it is not a gospel? My answer is that the Bhagvat Gita is neither a book of religion nor a treatise on philosophy. What the Bhagvat Gita does is to defend certain dogmas of religion on philosophic grounds. If on that account anybody wants to call it a book of religion or a book of philosophy he may please himself. But essentially it is neither. It uses philosophy to defend religion. My opponents will not be satisfied with a bare statement of view. They would insist on my proving my thesis by reference to specific instances. It is not at all difficult. Indeed it is the easiest task.

The first instance one comes across in reading the Bhagvat Gita is the justification of war. Arjuna had declared himself against the war, against killing people for the sake of property. Krishna offers a philosophic defence of war and killing in war. This philosophic defence of war will be found in Chapter II verses 11 to 28. The philosophic defence of war offered by the Bhagvat Gita proceeds along two lines of argument. One line of argument is that anyhow the world is perishable and man is mortal. Things are bound to come to an end. Man is bound to die. Why should it make any difference to the wise whether man dies a natural death or whether he is done to death as a result of violence? Life is unreal, why shed tears because it has ceased to be? Death is inevitable, why bother how it has resulted? The second line of argument in justification of war is that it is a mistake to think that the body and the soul are one. They are separate. Not only are the two quite distinct but they differ in-as-much as the body is perishable while the soul is eternal and imperishable. When death occurs it is the body that dies. The soul never dies. Not only does it never die but air cannot dry it, fire cannot burn it, and a weapon cannot cut it. It is therefore wrong to say that when a man is killed his soul is killed. What happens is that his body dies. His soul discards the dead body as a person discards his old clothes—wears a new ones and carries on. As the soul is never killed, killing a person can never be a matter of any movement. War and killing need therefore give no ground to remorse or to shame, so argues the Bhagvat Gita.

Another dogma to which the Bhagvat Gita comes forward to offer a philosophic defence is Chaturvarnya. The Bhagvat Gita, no doubt, mentions that the Chaturvarnya is created by God and therefore sacrosanct. But it does not make its validity dependent on it. It offers a philosophic basis to the theory of Chaturvarnya by linking it to the theory of innate, inborn qualities in men. The fixing of the Varna of

<sup>1</sup> And see, too, Chapter VII, stanza 17, where the man of knowledge is declared to be 'dear' to Krishna.

man is not an arbitrary act says the Bhagvat Gita. But it is fixed according to his innate, inborn qualities.<sup>1</sup>

The third dogma for which the Bhagvat Gita offers a philosophic defence is the Karma marga. By Karma marga the Bhagvat Gita means the performance of the observances, such as Yajnas as a way to salvation. The Bhagvat Gita most stands out for the Karma marga throughout and is a great upholder of it. The line it takes to defend Karma yoga is by removing the excrescences which had grown upon it and which had made it appear quite ugly. The first excrescence was blind faith. The Gita tries to remove it by introducing the principle of Buddhi yoga<sup>2</sup> as a necessary condition for Karma yoga. Become Stihitaprajna i.e., 'Befitted with Buddhi' there is nothing wrong in the performance of Karma kanda. The second excrescence on the Karma kanda was the selfishness which was the motive behind the performance of the Karmas. The Bhagvat Gita attempts to remove it by introducing the principle of *Anasakti* i.e., performance of karma without any attachment for the fruits of the *Karma*.<sup>3</sup> Founded in Buddhi yoga and dissociated from selfish attachment to the fruits of Karma what is wrong with the dogma of Karma kanda? this is how the Bhagvat Gita defends the Karma marga.<sup>4</sup> It would be quite possible to continue in this strain, to pick up other dogmas and show how the Gita comes forward to offer a philosophic defence in their support where none existed before. But this could be done only if one were to write a treatise on the Bhagvat Gita. it is beyond the scope of a chapter the main purpose of which is to assign to the Bhagvat Gita its proper place in the ancient Indian literature. I have therefore selected the most important dogmas just to illustrate my thesis.

Two other questions are sure to be asked in relation to my thesis. Whose are the Dogmas for which the Bhagvat Gita offers this philosophical defence? Why did it become necessary for the Bhagvat Gita to defend these Dogmas?

To begin with the first question, the dogmas which the Gita defends are the dogmas of counter-revolution as put forth in the Bible of counter-revolution namely Jaimini's Purvamimamsa. There ought to be no difficulty in accepting this proposition. If there is any it is largely due to wrong meaning attached to the word Karma yoga. Most writers on the Bhagvat Gita translate the word Karma yoga as 'action' and the word Janga yoga, as 'knowledge' and proceed to discuss the Bhagvat Gita as though it was engaged in comparing and contrasting

<sup>1</sup> Bhagvat Gita IV. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Bhagvat Gita II. 39-53.

<sup>3</sup> Bhagvat Gita II. 47.

<sup>4</sup> This is well summed up in Bhagvat Gita II. 48.

knowledge versus action in a generalized form. This is quite wrong. The Bhagvat Gita is not concerned with any general, philosophical discussion of action versus knowledge. As a matter of fact, the Gita is concerned with the particular and not with the general. By Karma yoga or action Gita means the dogmas contained in Jaimini's Karma kanda and by Jnana yoga or knowledge it means the dogmas contained in Badarayana's Brahma Sutras. That the Gita in speaking of Karma is not speaking of activity or inactivity, quieticism or energism, in general terms but religious acts and observances cannot be denied by anyone who has read the Bhagvat Gita. It is to life the Gita from the position of a party pamphlet engaged in a controversy on small petty points and make it appear as though it was a general treatise on matters of high philosophy that this attempt is made to inflate the meaning of the words Karma and Jnana and make them words of general import. Mr. Tilak is largely to be blamed for this trick of patriotic Indians. The result has been that these false meanings have misled people into believing that the Bhagvat Gita is an independent self-contained book and has no relation to the literature that has preceded it. But if one were to keep to the meaning of the word Karma yoga as one finds it in the Bhagvat Gita itself one would be convinced that in speaking of Karma yoga the Bhagvat Gita is referring to nothing but the dogmas of Karma kanda as propounded by Jaimini which it tries to renovate and strengthen.

To take up the second question: Why did the Bhagvat Gita feel it necessary to defend the dogmas of counter-revolution? To my mind the answer is very clear. It was to save them from the attack of Buddhism that the Bhagvat Gita came into being. Buddha preached non-violence. He not only preached it but the people at large—except the Brahmins—had accepted it as the way of life. They had acquired a repugnance to violence. Buddha preached against Chaturvarnya. He used some of the most offensive similes in attacking the theory of Chaturvarnya. The frame work of Chaturvarnya had been broken. The order of Chaturvarnya had been turned upside down. Shudras and women could become sannyasis, a status which counter-revolution had denied them. Buddha had condemned the Karma kanda and the Yajnas. he condemned them on the ground of *Himsa* or violence. He condemned them also on the ground that the motive behind them was a selfish desire to obtain bonus. What was the reply of the counter-revolutionaries to this attack? Only this. These things were ordained by the Vedas, the Vedas were infallible, therefore the dogmas were not to be questioned. In the Buddhist age, which was the most enlightened and the most rationalistic age India has known, dogmas resting on

such silly, arbitrary, unrationalistic and fragile foundations could hardly stand. People who had come to believe in non-violence as a principle of life and had gone so far as to make it a rule of life—How could they be expected to accept the dogma that the Kshatriya may kill without sinning because the Vedas say that it is his duty to kill? People who had accepted the gospel of social equality and who were remaking society on the basis of each one according to his merits—how could they accept the chaturvarnya theory of gradation, and separation of man based on birth simply because the Vedas say so? People who had accepted the doctrine of Buddha that all misery in society is due to Tanha or what Tawny calls acquisitive instinct—how could they accept the religion which deliberately invited people to obtain boons by sacrifices merely because there is behind it the authority of the Vedas? There is no doubt that under the furious attack of Buddhism, Jaimini's counter-revolutionary dogmas were tottering and would have collapsed had they not received the support which the Bhagvat Gita gave them. The philosophic defence of the counter-revolutionary doctrines given by the Bhagwat Gita is by no means impregnable. The philosophic defence offered by the Bhagwat Gita of the Kshatriya's duty to kill is to say the least puerile. To say that killing is no killing because what is killed is the body and not the soul is an unheard of defence of murder. This is one of the doctrines which make some people say that the doctrines make one's hair stand on their end. If Krishna were to appear as a lawyer acting for a client who is being tried for murder and pleaded the defence set out by him in the Bhagwat Gita there is not the slightest doubt that he would be sent to the lunatic asylum. Similarly childish is the defence of the Bhagwat Gita of the dogma of chaturvarnya. Krishna defends it on the basis of the Guna theory of the Sankhya. But Krishna does not seem to have realized what a fool he has made of himself. In the chaturvarnya there are four Varnas. But the gunas according to the Sankhyas are only three. How can a system of four varnas be defended on the basis of a philosophy which does not recognise more than three varnas? The whole attempt of the Bhagwat Gita to offer a philosophic defence of the dogmas of counter-revolution is childish—and does not deserve a moment's serious thought. None-the-less there is not the slightest doubt that without the help of the Bhagwat Gita the counter-revolution would have died out, out of sheer stupidity of its dogmas. Mischievous as it may seem, to the revolutionaries the part played by the Bhagwat Gita, there is no doubt that it resuscitated counter-revolution and if the counter-revolution lives even today, it is entirely due to the plausibility of the philosophic defence which it received from the Bhagwat Gita—anti-



Veda and anti-Yajna. Nothing can be a greater mistake than this. As will appear from other portions of the Bhagvat Gita that it is not against the authority of the vedas and shastras (XVI, 23, 24: XVII, 11, 13, 24). Nor is it against the sanctity of the yajnas (III. 9-15). It upholds the virtue of both. There is therefore no difference between Jaimini's Purva Mimansa and the Bhagvat Gita. If anything, the Bhagvat Gita is a more formidable supporter of counter-revolution than Jaimini's Purva Mimansa could have ever been. It is formidable because it seeks to give to the doctrines of counter-revolution that philosophic and therefore permanent basis which they never had before and without which they would never have survived. Particularly formidable than Jaimini's Purva Mimansa is the philosophic support which the Bhagvat Gita gives to the central doctrine of counter-revolution—namely Chaturvarnya. The soul of the Bhagvat Gita seems to be the defence of Chaturvarnya and securing its observance in practice, Krishna does not merely rest content with saying that Chaturvarnya is based on Guna-karma but he goes further and issues two positive injunctions. The first injunction is contained in Chapter III verse 26. In this Krishna says: that a wise man should not by counter propaganda create a doubt in the mind of an ignorant person who is follower of Karma kand which of course includes the observance of the rules of Chaturvarnya. In other words, you must not agitate or excite people to rise in rebellion against the theory of Karma kand and all that it includes. The second injunction is laid down in Chapter XVIII verses 41-48. In this Krishna tells that every one do the duty prescribed for his Varna and no other and warns those who worship him and are his devotees that they will not obtain salvation by mere devotion but by devotion accompanied by observance of duty laid down for his Varna. In short, a Shudra however great he may be as a devotee will not get salvation if he has transgressed the duty of the Shudra—namely to live and die in the service of the higher classes. The second part of my thesis is that the essential function of the Bhagvat gita to give new support to Jaimini at least those portions of it which offer philosophic defence of Jaimini's doctrines—has become to be written after Jaimini's Purva Mimansa had been promulgated. The third part of my thesis is that this philosophic defence of the Bhagvat Gita, of the doctrines of counter-revolution became necessary because of the attack to which they were subjected by the revolutionary and rationalistic thought of Buddhism.

I must now turn to the objections that are likely to be raised against the validity of my thesis. I see one looming large before me. I shall be told that I am assuming that the Bhagvat Gita is posterior in time to

Buddhism and to Jaimini's Purva Mimansa and that this assumption has no warrant behind it. I am aware of the fact that my thesis runs counter to the most cherished view of Indian scholars all of whom, seem to be more concerned in fixing a very ancient date to the composition of the Bhagvat Gita far anterior to Buddhism and to Jaimini than in finding out what is the message of the Bhagvat Gita and what value it has as a guide to man's life. This is particularly the case with Mr. Telang and Mr. Tilak. But as Garbe<sup>1</sup> observes "To Telang, as to every Hindu—how much so ever enlightened—it is an article of faith to believe in so high an antiquity of the Bhagvat Gita and where such necessities are powerful criticism indeed comes to an end."

In the words of Prof. Garbe:

"The task of assigning a date to the Gita has been recognized by every one who has earnestly tried to solve the problem, as being very difficult; and the difficulties grow (all the more) if the problem is presented two fold, viz., to determine as well the age of the original Gita as also of its revision. I am afraid that generally speaking, we shall succeed in arriving, not at any certainties, but only at probabilities in this matter."

What are the probabilities? I have no doubt that the probabilities are in favour of my thesis. Indeed so far as I can see there is nothing against it. In examining this question, I propose first to advance direct evidence from the Gita itself showing that it has been composed after Jaimini's Purva Mimansa and after Buddhism.

Chapter III verses 9-13 of the Bhagvat Gita have a special significance. In this connection it is true that the Bhagvat Gita does not refer to Jaimini by name: nor does it mention Mimansa by name. But is there any doubt that in Chapter III verses 9-18 the Bhagvat Gita is dealing with the doctrines formulated by Jaimini in his Purva Mimansa? Even Mr. Tilak<sup>2</sup> who believes in the antiquity of the Bhagvat Gita has to admit that here the Gita is engaged in the examination of the Purva Mimansa doctrines. There is another way of presenting this argument. Jaimini preaches pure and simple Karma yoga. The Bhagvat Gita on the other hand preaches *anasakti* karma. Thus the Gita preaches a doctrine which is fundamentally modified. Not only the Bhagvat Gita modifies the Karma yoga but attacks the upholders of pure and simple Karma yoga in somewhat severe terms.<sup>3</sup> If the Gita is prior to Jaimini one would expect Jaimini to take note of this attack of the Bhagvat Gita and reply to it. But we do not find any reference in Jaimini to this *anasakti* karma yoga of the Bhagvat Gita.

<sup>1</sup> Introduction (Indian Antiquary Supplement) p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Gita Rahasya Vol. II. 916-922.

<sup>3</sup> Bhagvat Gita II. 42-46 and XVIII 66.

Why? The only answer is that this modification came after Jaimini and not before—which is simply another way of saying that the Bhagvat Gita was composed after Jaimini's Purva Mimansa.

If the Bhagvat Gita does not mention Purva Mimansa it does mention by name the Brahma Sutras<sup>1</sup> of Badarayana. This reference to Brahma Sutras is a matter of great significance for it furnishes direct evidence for the conclusion that the Gita is later than the Brahma Sutras.

Mr. Tilak<sup>2</sup> admits that the reference to the Brahma Sutras is a clear and definite reference to the treatise of that name which we now have. It may be pointed out that Mr. Telang<sup>3</sup> discusses the subject in a somewhat cavalier fashion by saying that the treatise "Brahma Sutras" referred to in the Bhagvat Gita is different from the present treatise which goes by that name. He gives no evidence for so extraordinary a proposition but relies on the conjectural statement of Mr. Weber<sup>4</sup>—given in a foot-note of his Treatise in Indian Literature, again without any evidence—that the mention of Brhma Sutras in the Bhagvat Gita "may be taken as an appellative rather than as a proper name." It would not be fair to attribute any particular motives to Mr. Telang for the view he has taken on this point. But there is nothing unfair in saying that Mr. Telang<sup>5</sup> shied at admitting the reference to Brahma Sutra because he saw that Weber had on the authority of Winternitz assigned 500 A.D. to the composition of the Brahma Sutras, which would have destroyed his cherished theory regarding the antiquity of the Bhagvat Gita. There is thus ample internal evidence to support the conclusion that the Gita was composed after Jaimini's Purva Mimansa and Badarayana's Brahma Sutras.

Is the Bhagvat Gita anterior to Buddhism? the question was raised by Mr. Telang:

"We come now to another point. What is the position of the Gita in regard to the great reform of Sakya Muni? The question is one of much interest, having regard particularly to the remarkable coincidences between Buddhistic doctrines and the doctrines of the Gita to which we have drawn attention in the footnotes to our translation. But the materials for deciding the question are unhappily not forth coming. Professor Wilson, indeed, thought that there was

<sup>1</sup> Bhagvat Gita XIII. 4

<sup>2</sup> Gita Rahasya II. p. 749.

<sup>3</sup> Bhagvat Gita (S.B.E.) Introduction p. 31.

<sup>4</sup> History of Indian Literature p. 242 f.n.

<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, it may be said that Mr. Tilak readily admitted the reference because it was his opinion that Brahma Sutras were a very ancient treatise—see Gita Rahasya Vol. II.

an allusion to Buddhism in the Gita.<sup>1</sup> but his idea was based on a confusion between the Buddhists and the Charvakas or materialists.<sup>2</sup> Failing that allusion, we have nothing very tangible but the unsatisfactory 'negative argument' based on mere non-mention of Buddhism in the Gita. That argument is not quite satisfactory to my own mind, although, as I have elsewhere pointed out,<sup>3</sup> some of the ground occupied by the Gita is common to it with Buddhism, and although various previous thinkers are alluded to directly or indirectly in the Gita. There is, however, one view of the facts of this question, which appears to me to corroborate the conclusion deducible by means of the negative argument here referred to. The main points on which Buddha's protest against Brahmanism rests, seem to be the true authority of the Vedas and the true view of the differences of caste. On most points of doctrinal speculation, Buddhism is still but one aspect of the older Brahmanism.<sup>4</sup> The various coincidences to which we have drawn attention show that, if there is need to show it. Well now, on both these points, the Gita, while it does not go the whole length which Buddha goes, itself embodies a protest against the views current about the time of its composition. The Gita does not, like Buddhism, absolutely reject the Vedas, but it shelves them. The Gita does not totally root out caste. It places caste on a less untenable basis. One of two hypothesis therefore presents itself as a rational theory of these facts. Either the Gita and Buddhism were alike the outward manifestation of one and the same spiritual upheaval which shook to its centre the current religion, the Gita being the earlier and less thorough going form of it; or Buddhism having already begun to tell on Brahmanism, the Gita was an attempt to bolster it up, so to say, at its least weak points, the weaker ones being altogether abandoned. I do not accept the latter alternative, because I cannot see any indication in the Gita of an attempt to compromise with a powerful attack on the old Hindu system while the fact that, though strictly orthodox, the author of the Gita still undermines the authority, as unwisely venerated, of the Vedic revelation; and the further fact, that in doing this, he is doing what others also had done before him or about his time; go, in my opinion, a considerable way towards fortifying the results of the negative argument already set forth. To me Buddhism is perfectly intelligible as one outcome of that play of thought on high

<sup>1</sup> Essays on Sanskrit Literature, Vo. III p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> See our remarks on this point in the Introductory Essay to our Gita in verse p. II seq.

<sup>3</sup> Introduction to Gita in English verse p. v. seq.

<sup>4</sup> Cr. Max Muller's Hibbert Lectures, p. 137 Webet's Indian Literature, pp. 288, 289; and Rhys Davids'

spiritual topics, which in its other, and as we may say, less thorough going, manifestation we see in the Upanishads and the Gita<sup>1</sup>."

I have quoted this passage in full because it is typical of all Hindu scholars. Everyone of them is most reluctant to admit that the Bhagvat Gita is anyway influenced by Buddhism and is ever ready to deny that the Gita has borrowed anything from Buddhism. It is the attitude of Prof. Radhakrishnan and also of Tilak. Where there is any similarity in thought between the Bhagvat Gita and Buddhism too strong and too close to be denied, the argument is that it is borrowed from the Upanishads. It is typical of the mean mentality of the counter-revolutionaries not to allow any credit to Buddhism on any account.

The absurdity of these views must shock all those who have made a comparative study of the Bhagvat Gita and the Buddhist Suttas. For if it is true to say that Gita is saturated with Sankhya philosophy it is far more true to say that the Gita is full of Buddhist ideas.<sup>2</sup> The similarity between the two is not merely in ideas but also in language. A few illustrations will show how true it is.

The Bhagvat Gita discusses Bramha-Nirvana.<sup>3</sup> The steps by which one reaches Bramha. Nirvana are stated by the Bhagvat Gita to be (1) Shraddha (Faith in oneself); (2) Vyavasaya (Firm determination); (3) Smriti (Rememberance of the goal); (4) Samadhi (Earnest contemplation) and (5) Prajna (Insight or True Knowledge). From where has the Gita borrowed this Nirvana theory? Surely it is not borrowed from the Upanishads. For no Upanishad even mentions the word Nirvana. The whole idea is peculiarly Buddhist and is borrowed from Buddhism. Anyone who has any doubt on the point may compare this Bramha-Nirvana of the Bhagvat Gita with the Buddhist conception of Nirvana as set out in the Mahapari-nibbana Sutta. It will be found that they are the same which the Gita has laid down for Bramha-Nirvana. Is it not a fact that the Bhagvat Gita has borrowed the entire conception of Brmhma Nirvana instead of Nirvana for no other reason except to conceal the fact of its having stolen it from Buddhism?

Take another illustration. In Chapter VII verses 13-20 there is a discussion as to who is dear to Krishna; one who has knowledge, or one who performs karma or one who is a devotee. Krishna says that the Devotees is dear to him but adds that he must have the true marks

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Weber's History of Indian Literature, p. 285. In Mr. Davids' Buddhism, p. 94 we have a noteworthy extract from a standard Buddhistic work, touching the existence of the soul. Compare that with the corresponding doctrine in the Gita. It will be found that the two are at one in rejecting the identity of the soul with the senses &c. The Gita then goes on to admit a soul separate from these. Buddhism rejects that also, and sees nothing but the senses.

<sup>2</sup> On this point compare Bhagvat Gita by S. D. Budhiraja M.A., L.L.B., Chief Judge, Kashmir. At every point the author has attempted to draw attention to textual similarities between the Gita and Buddhism.

<sup>3</sup> Max Muller Mahapari-Nibbana Sutta p. 63.

of a Devotee. What is the charcter of a true Devotee? According to Krishna the true devotee is one who practices (1) Maitri; (loving Kindness); (2) Karuna (compassion); (3) Mudita (sympathizing joy) and (4) Upeksa (unconcernedness). From where has the Bhagvate Gita borrowed these qualifications of a perfect Devotee? Here again, the source is Buddhism. Those who want proof may compare the Mahapadana Sutta,<sup>1</sup> and the Tevijja Sutta<sup>2</sup> where Buddha has preached what Bhavanas (mental attitude) are necessary for one to cherish for the training of the heart. This comparison will show that the whole ideology is borrowed from Buddhism and that too word for word.

Take a third illustration. In chapter XIII the Bhagvat Gita descusses the subject of Kshetra-Kshetrajna. In verses 7-11 Krishna points out what is knowledge and what is ignorance in the following language:

“Pridelessness (Humility), Unpretentiousness, Non-injury or Harmlessness, Forgiveness, Straight-forwardness, (uprightness), Devotion to Preceptor, Purity, Steadiness, Self-restraint, Desirelessness towards objects of sense, absence of Egoism, Reflection on the suffering and evil of Birth, Death, decrepitude and disease, Non-attachment, Non-identification of oneself with regard to son, wife and home and the rest, Constant even-mindedness on approach of both (what is) agreeable and (what is) disagreeable unswerving devotion to Me with undivided meditation of Me, Resort to sequestered spots (contemplation, concentration, in solitude), Distaste for the society of worldly men, Incessant application to the knowledge relating to self, Perception or realisation of the true purport of the knowledge of the Tattvas (Samkhya Philosophy), all this is called ‘knowledge’; what is Ajnana (Ignorance) which is the reverse thereof.”

Can anyone who knows anything of the Gospel of Buddha deny that the Bhagvat Gita has not in these stanzas reproduced word for word the main doctrines of Buddhism?

In chapter XIII verses 5, 6, 18, 19, the Bhagvat Gita gives a new metaphorical interpretation of karmas under various heads (1) Yajnas (sacrifices); (2) Dana (Gifts); (3) Tapas (penances); (4) Food and (5) Svadhyaya (Vedic study). What is the source of this new interpretation of old ideas? Compare with this what Buddha is reported to have said in the Majjhina Nikaya I, 286 Sutta XVI. Can anyone doubt that what Krishna says in verses 5, 6, 18, 19 of chapter XVII is a verbatim reproduction of the words of Buddha?

<sup>1</sup> See Mahapadana Sutta p.

<sup>2</sup> Tevijja Sutta p.

These are only a few illustrations I have selected those of major doctrinal importance. Those who are interested in pursuing the subject may take up the reference to similarities between Gita and Buddhism given by Telang in the footnotes to his edition of the Bhagvat Gita and satisfy their curiosity. But the illustrations I have given will be enough to show how greatly the Bhagvat Gita is permeated by Buddhistic ideology and how much the Gita has borrowed from Buddhism. To sum up the Bhagvat Gita seems to be deliberately modelled on Buddhists Suttas. The Buddhists Suttas are dialogues. So is the Bhagvat Gita. Buddha's religion offered salvation to women and Shudras. Krishna also comes forward to offer salvation to women and Shudras. Buddhists say, "I surrender to Buddha, to Dhamma and to Sangha." So Krishna says, "Give up all religions and surrender unto Me." No parallel can be closer than what exists between Buddhism and Bhagvat Gita.

#### IV

I have shown that Gita is later than Purva Mimansa and also later than Buddhism. I could well stop here. But I feel I cannot. For there still remains one argument against my thesis which requires to be answered. It is the argument of Mr. Tilak. It is an ingenious argument. Mr. Tilak realizes that there are many similarities in ideas and in words between the Bhagvat Gita and Buddhism. Buddhism being earlier than the Bhagvat Gita, the obvious conclusion is that the Bhagvat Gita is the debtor and Buddhism is the creditor. This obvious conclusion is not palatable to Mr. Tilak or for the matter of that to all upholders of counter-revolution. With them it is a question of honour that counter-revolution should not be shown to be indebted to Revolution. To get over this difficulty Mr. Tilak has struck a new line. He points out the distinction between Hinayana Buddhism and Mahayana Buddhism and say, that Mahayana Buddhism was later than Bhagvat Gita and if there are any similarities between the Buddhism and Bhagvat Gita it is due to the borrowing by the Mahayanist from the Bhagvat Gita. This raises two questions. What is the date of the origin of the Mahayana Buddhism? What is the date of the composition of the Bhagvat Gita? The argument of Mr. Tilak is ingenious and clever. But it has no substance. In the first place, it is not original. It is based on certain casual remarks made by Winternitz<sup>1</sup> and by Kern<sup>2</sup> in foot-notes that there are certain similitudes between

<sup>1</sup> History of Indian Literature (English Translation) Vol. II p. 229 foot-note.

<sup>2</sup> Manual of Indian Buddhism p. 122- foot-note.

the Bhagvat Gita and the Mahayan Buddhism and that there similarities are the result of Mahayana Buddhism borrowing its ideas from the Bhagvat Gita. Behind these remarks there is no evidence of special research either on the part of Winternitz, Kern or Mr. Tilak. All of them seem to be led away by the assumption that the Bhagvat Gita is earlier than Mahayana Buddhism.

This leads me to examine the question of the date of the Bhagvat Gita particularly with reference to the theory as put forth by Mr. Tilak. Mr. Tilak<sup>1</sup> is of opinion that the Gita is part of the Mahabharata and that both have been written by one and the same author named Vyasa and consequently the date of the Mahabharata must be the date of the Bhagvat Gita. The Mahabharata, Mr. Tilak argues, must have been written at least 500 years before the Shaka Era on the ground that the stories contained in the Mahabharata were known to Megasthenes who was in India about 300 B.C. as a Greek ambassador to the court of Chandragupta Maurya. The Shaka Era began in 78 A.D. On this basis it follows that the Bhagvat Gita must have been composed before 422 B.C. This is his view about the date of the composition of the present Gita. According to him, the original Gita must have been some centuries older than Mahabharata. If reliance be placed on the tradition referred to in the Bhagvat Gita that the religion of the Bhagvat Gita was taught by Nara to Narayan in very ancient times. Mr. Tilak's theory as to the date of the composition of the Mahabharata is untenable. In the first place, it assumes that the whole of the Bhagvat Gita and the whole of Mahabharat have been written at one stretch, at one time and by one hand. There is no warrant for such an assumption, either in tradition, or in the internal evidence of these two treatises. Confining the discussion to the Mahabharata the assumption made by Mr. Tilak is quite opposed to well-known Indian traditions. This tradition divides the composition of the Mahabharata into three stages; (1) Jaya (2) Bharata and (3) Mahabharata and assigns to each part a different author. According to this tradition Vyasa was the author of the 1st edition so to say of the Mahabharata called 'Jaya'. Of the Second Edition called 'Bharata' tradition assigns the authorship to Vaishampayana and that of the Third Edition called Mahabharata to 'Sauti'. That this tradition is well-founded has been confirmed by the researches of Prof. Hopkins based on the examination of internal evidence furnished by the Mahabharata. According to Prof. Hopkins<sup>2</sup> there have been several stages in the composition of the Mahabharata. As has been pointed

<sup>1</sup> Gita Rahasya Vol II. p. 791-800.

<sup>2</sup> The Great Epic of India p. 398.



out by Prof. Hopkins<sup>1</sup> in the first stage it was just a Pandu Epic consisting of plays and legends about heroes who took part in the Mahabharata war without the masses of didactic material. Such a Mahabharata, says Prof. Hopkins, may have come into existence between 400-200 B.C. The second stage was the remaking of the epic by the inclusion of didactic matter and the addition of Puranic material. This was between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D. The third stage is marked when (1) the last books were added to the composition as it stood at the end of the second stage with the introduction of the first book and (2) the swollen Anushasana Parva was separated from Shanti Parva and recognized as a separate book. This happened between 200 to 400 A.D. To these three stages Prof. Hopkins adds a fourth or a final stage of occasional amplification which started from 400 A.D. onwards. In coming to this conclusion Prof. Hopkins has anticipated and dealt with all the arguments advanced by Mr. Tilak such as the mention of Mahabharata in Panini<sup>2</sup> and in the Grihyasutras.<sup>3</sup> The only new pieces of evidence produced by Mr. Tilak which has not been considered by Prof. Hopkins are two. One such piece of evidence consists of the statements which are reported to have been recorded by Megasthenes,<sup>4</sup> the Greek Ambassador to the court of Chandra Gupta Maurya, and the other is the astronomical evidence<sup>5</sup>, in the Adi Parva which refers to the Uttarayana starting with the Shravana constellation. The facts adduced by Mr. Tilak as coming from Megasthenes may not be denied and may go to prove that at the time of Megasthenes i.e., about 300 B.C. a cult of Krishna worship had come into existence among the Sauraseni community. But how can this prove that the Mahabharata had then come into existence? It cannot. Nor can it prove that the legends and stories mentioned by Megasthenes were taken by him from the Mahabharata. For there is nothing to militate against the view that these legends and stories were a floating mass of Saga and that it served as a reservoir both to the writer of the Mahabharata as well as to Greek Ambassador.

Mr. Tilak's astronomical evidence may be quite sound. He is right in saying<sup>6</sup> that "it is stated in the Anugita that Visvamitra started the enumeration of the constellation with Shravana (Ma.Bha.Asva.44.2, and Adi.71.34). That has been interpreted by commentators as showing that the Uttarayana then started with the Shravana constellation, and no other interpretation is proper. At the date of the

<sup>1</sup> The Great Epic of India p. 398.

<sup>2</sup> The Great Epic of India p. 395.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid p. 390.

<sup>4</sup> Gita Rahasya II p. 79.

<sup>5</sup> Gita Rahasya II p. 789.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid p. 789.

Vedanga-Jyotisa, the Uttarayana used to start with the Sun in the Dhanistha constellation. According to astronomical calculations, the date when the Uttarayana should start with the Sun in the Dhanistha constellation to about 1,500 years before the Saka era; and according to astronomical calculations, it takes about a thousand years for the Uttarayana to start one constellation earlier. According to this calculation, the date when the Uttarayana ought to start with the Sun in the Shravana constellation comes to about 500 years before the Saka era. This conclusion would have been proper if it was true that the Mahabharata was one whole piece, written at one time by one author. It has, however, been shown that there is no warrant for such an assumption. In view of this Mr. Tilak's astronomical evidence cannot be used to determine the date of the Mahabharata. It can be used only to determine the date of that part of the Mahabharata which is affected by it—in this case the Adi Parva of the Mahabharata. For these reasons Mr. Tilak's theory as to the date of the composition of the Mahabharata must fall to the ground. Indeed any attempt to fix a single date for a work like the Mahabharata which is a serial story produced in parts at long intervals must be regarded as futile. All that one can say is that the Mahabharata was composed between 400B.C. to 400A.D. a conclusion too broad to be used for the purpose which Mr. Tilak has in view. Even this span seems to some scholars to be too narrow. It is contended<sup>1</sup> that the reference to *Edukas* in the 190th Adhyaya of the Vanaparva has been wrongly interpreted to mean Buddhist Stupas when, as a matter of fact, it refers to the *Idgahas* created by the Muslim invaders for Muslim converts. If this interpretation is correct it would show that parts of the Mahabharata were written about or after the invasions of Mohammed Ghorī.

Let me now turn to examine Mr. Tilak's theory as to the date of the composition of the Bhagvat Gita. There are really two propositions underlying his theory. First is that the Gita is part of the Mahabharata, both are written at one time and are the handiwork of one man. His second proposition is that the Bhagvat Gita has been the same what it is today from the very beginning when it first came to be written. To avoid confusion I propose to take them separately.

Mr. Tilak's object in linking the Gita with the Mahabharata in the matter of its composition is quite obvious. It is to have the date of the Mahabharata which he thinks is known to determine the date of the Bhagvat Gita which is unknown. The basis on which Mr. Tilak has tried to establish an integral connection between the Mahabharata and the Bhagvat Gita is unfortunately the weakest part of his theory. To

<sup>1</sup> Dharmanand Kausambi — Hindi Sanskriti ani Ahimsa (Marathi) p. 156.

accept that the Gita is a part of the Mahabharata because the author of both is Vyasa—and this is the argument of Mr. Tilak—is to accept a fiction for a fact. It assumes that Vyasa is the name of some particular individual capable of being identified. This is evident from the fact that we have Vyasa as the author of the Mahabharata, Vyasa as the author of the Puranas, Vyasa as the author of Bhagvat Gita and Vyasa as the author of the Bramha Sutras. It cannot therefore be accepted as true that the same Vyasa is the author of all these works separated as they are by a long span of time extending to several centuries. It is well-known how orthodox writers wishing to hide their identity get better authority for their works by the use of a revered name were in the habit of using Vyasa as a *nom-de-plume* or pen name. If the author of the Gita is a Vyasa he must be a different Vyasa. There is another argument which seems to militate against Mr. Tilak's theory of synchronicity between the composition of the Bhagvat Gita and the Mahabharata. The Mahabharata consists of 18 Parvas. There are also 18 Puranas. It is curious to find that Bhagvat Gita has also 18 Adhyayas. The question is: Why should there be this parallelism? The answer is that the ancient Indian writers regarded certain names and certain numbers as invested with great sanctity. The name Vyasa and the number 18 are illustrations of this fact. But there is more in the fixation of 18 as the chapters of the Bhagvat Gita than is apparent on the face of it. Who set 18 as the sacred number, the Mahabharata or the Gita? If the Mahabharata, then Gita must have been written after the Mahabharata. If it is the Bhagvat Gita, then the Mahabharata must have been written after the Gita. In any case, the two could not have been written at one and the same time.

These considerations may not be accepted as decisive against Mr. Tilak's first proposition. But there is one which I think is decisive. I refer to the relative position of Krishna in the Mahabharata and in the Bhagvat Gita. In the Mahabharata, Krishna is nowhere represented as a God accepted by all. The Mahabharata itself shows the people were not prepared even to give him the first place. When at the time of the Rajasuya Yajna, Dharma offered to give Krishna priority in the matter of honouring the guest, Shishupala—the near relation of Krishna—protested and abused Krishna. He not only charged him with low origin, but also with loose morals, an intriguer who violated rules of war for the sake of victory. So abhorrent but so true was this record of Krishna's foul deeds that when Duryodhan flung them in the face of Krishna, the Mahabharata itself in the Gada Parva records that the Gods in heaven came out to listen to the charges made by Duryodhan against Krishna and after listening showered flowers as

a token of their view that the charges contained the whole truth and nothing but the truth. On the other hand, the Bhagvat Gita presented Krishna as God omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, pure, loving, essence of goodness. Two such works containing two quite contradictory estimates about one and the same personality could not have been written at one and the same time by one and the same author. It is a pity that Mr. Tilak in his anxiety to give a pre-Buddhist date to the composition of the Bhagvat Gita should have completely failed to take note of these important considerations.

The second proposition of Mr. Tilak is equally unsound. The attempt to fix a date for the composition of the Bhagvat Gita is nothing but the pursuit of a mirage. It is doomed to failure. The reason is that the Bhagvat Gita is not a single book written by a single author. It consists of different parts written at different times by different authors.

Prof. Garbe is the only scholar who has seen the necessity of following this line of inquiry. Prof. Garbe hold that there are two parts of the Bhagvat Gita one original and one added. I am not satisfied with this statement. My reading of the Bhagvat Gita leads me to the conclusion that there have been four separate parts of Bhagvat Gita. They are so distinct that taking even the present treatise as it stands they can be easily marked off.

(i) The original Gita was nothing more than a heroic tale told or a ballad recited by the bards of how Arjuna was not prepared to fight and how Krishna forced him to engage in battle, how Arjuna yielded and so on. It may have been a romantic story but there was nothing religious or philosophical in it.

This original Gita will be found embedded in Chapter I, Chapter II, verses . . . . and Chapter XI verses 32-33 in which Krishna is reported to have ended the argument:

“Be my tool, carry out my will, don't worry about sin and evil resulting from fighting, do as I tell you, don't be impudent.”.

This is the argument which Krishna used to compel Arjuna to fight. And this argument of coercion and compulsion made Arjuna yield. Krishna probably threatened Arjuna with brute force if he did not actually use it. The assumption of Vishva-rupa by Krishna is only different way of describing the use of brute force. On that theory it is possible that the chapter in the present Bhagvat Gita dealing with Vishva-rupa is also a part of the original Bhagvat Gita.

(ii) The first patch on the original Bhagvat Gita is the part in which Krishna is spoken of as Ishvara, the God of the Bhagvat religion. This part of the Gita is embedded in those verses of the present Bhagvat Gita which are devoted to Bhakti Yoga.

(iii) The second patch on the original Bhagvat Gita is the part which introduces the Sankhya and the Vedanta philosophy as a defence to the doctrines of Purva Mimansa which they did not have before. The Gita was originally only a historical Saga with the cult of Krishna came to be interwoven. The Philosophy portion of the Bhagvat Gita was a later intrusion can be proved quite easily from the nature of the original dialogue and the sequence of it.

In chapter I verses 20-47 Arjuna mentions those difficulties. In chapter II Krishna attempts to meet the difficulties mentioned by Arjuna. There are arguments and counter arguments. Krishna's first argument is contained in verse 2 and 3 in which Krishna tells Arjuna that his conduct is infamous, unbecoming an Arya and that he should not play the part of an effeminate which was unworthy of him. To this, Arjuna gives a reply which is embodied in verses 4 to 8. In verses 4 to 5 he says, "how can I kill Bhishma and Drona who are entitled to highest reverence: it would be better to live by begging than kill them. I do not wish to live to enjoy a kingdom won by killing old revered elders." In verses 6 to 8 Arjuna says: "I do not know which of the two is more meritorious, whether we should vanquish the Kauravas or whether we should be vanquished by them." Krishna's reply to this is contained in verses 11 to 39 in which he propounds (i) that grief is unjustified because things are imperishable, (ii) that it is a false view that a man is killed when the atman is eternal and (iii) that he must fight because it is the duty of the Kshatriya to fight.

Any one who reads the dialogue will notice the following points:

(1) The questions put by Arjuna are *not* philosophical questions. They are natural questions put by a worldly man faced with worldly problems.

(2) Upto a point Krishna treats them as natural questions and returns to them quite natural replies.

(3) The dialogue takes a new turn. Arjuna after having informed Krishna positively and definitely that he will not fight, suddenly takes a new turn and expresses a doubt whether it is a good to kill the Kauravas or be killed by them. This is a deliberate departure designed to give Krishna a philosophical defence of war, uncalled for by anything said by Arjuna.

(4) Again there is a drop in the tone of Krishna from verses 31 to 38. He treats the question as natural and tells him to fight because it is the duty of the Kshatriya to fight.

Anyone can see from this that the introduction of the Vedanta philosophy is quite unnatural and therefore a later intrusion. With regard to the introduction of the Sankhya philosophy the case is quite

obvious. Often it is expounded without any question by Arjuna and whenever it has been propounded in answer to a question that question has nothing to do with the war. This shows that the philosophic parts of the Bhagvat Gita are not parts of the original Gita but have been added later on and in order to find a place for them, new, appropriate and leading questions have been put in the mouth of Arjuna which have nothing to do with the mundane problems of war.

(iv) The third patch on the oriinal Bhagvat Gita consists of verses in which Krishna is elevated from the position of Ishwara to that of Parmeshwara. This patch can be easily detected as being chapters X and XV where Krishna says:

(Quotation not mentioned) .....

As I said, to go in for a precise date for the composition of the Bhagvat Gita is to go on a fool's errand and that if an attempt in that direction is to be of any value, effort must be directed to determine the date of each patch separately. Proceeding in this way it is possible that what I have called the original unphilosophic Bhagvat Gita was part of the first edition of the Mahabharata called Jaya. The first patch on the original Bhagvat Gita in which Krishna is depicted as Ishwara must be placed in point of date sometimes later than Megasthenes when Krishna was only a tribal God.<sup>1</sup> How much later it is not possible to say. But it must be considerably later. For it must be remembered that the Brahmins were not friendly to Krishnaism in the beginning. In fact they were opposed to it.<sup>2</sup> It must have taken some time before the Brahmins could have become reconciled to Krishna worship.<sup>3</sup>

The second patch on the original Bhavat Gita having reference to Sankhya and Vedanta must for reason already given be placed later than the Sutras of Jaimini and Badarayana. The question of the date of these Sutras has carefully been examined by Prof. Jacobi<sup>4</sup>. His conclusion is that these Sutras were composed sometime between 200 and 450 A.D.

The third patch on the original Bhagvat Gita in which Krishna is raised into Parmeshvara must be placed during the reign of the Gupta Kings. The reason is obvious. Gupta kings made Krishna-Vasudev their family deity as their opponents the Shaka kings had made

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Bhandarkar in his 'Saivism and Vaishnavism' says, "If the Vasudeva Krishna worship prevailed in the time of the first Maurya it must have originated long before the establishment of the Maurya dynasty." This is an unexceptionable statement. But it seems to me that a distinction must be made between Krishna as a tribal God and Krishna as an universalized Ishwara. The date for the first may be what Dr. Bhandarkar suggests but the same cannot be the date for the second. In the Gita we are concerned with the second.

<sup>2</sup> See Shamshastri Memorial Volume.

Mahadeo their family deity. The Brahmins to whom religion has been a trade, who were never devoted to one God but came forward to worship the deity of the ruling race thought of pleasing their masters by making their family deity into a high and mighty Parmeshvar. If this is correct explanation then this patch on the original Bhagvat Gita must be placed between 400 and 464 A.D.

All this goes to confirm the view that the attempt to place the Bhagvat Gita prior in point of time to Buddhism cannot succeed. It is the result of wishful thinking on the part of those who have inherited a positive dislike to Buddha and his revolutionary gospel. History does not support it. History proves quite abnormally that at any rate those portions of the Bhagvat Gita which have any doctrinal value are considerably later in point of time to the Buddhist canon and the Sutras of Jaimini and Badarayana.

The discussion of the dates not only proves that the Bhagvat Gita is later than Hinayana Buddhism but is also later than Mahayana Buddhism. The impression prevails that Mahayana Buddhism is later in origin. It is supposed to have come into being after A.D. 100 when Kanishka held the third Buddhist Council to settle the dissension in the Buddhist Church. This is absolutely a mistake.<sup>1</sup> It is not true that after the Council a new creed of Buddhism came into existence. What happened is that new names of abuse came into existence for parties which were very old. As Mr. Kimura has shown the Mahayanist is simply another name for the sect of Buddhists known as Mahasanghikas. The sect of Mahasanghikas had come into being very much earlier than is supposed to be the case. If tradition be believed the sect had come into being at the time of the First Buddhist Council held at Pataliputra 236 years after the death of Buddha i.e., 307 B.C.<sup>2</sup> for settling the Buddhist canon and is said to have led the opposition to the Theravad sect of Buddhism which later on came to be stigmatized as Hinayana (which means those holding to the low path). There could hardly be any trace of Bhagvat Gita when the Mahasanghikas later known as Mahayanists came into being.

Apart from this what have the Mahayanists borrowed from the Bhagvat Gita? Indeed what can they borrow from the Bhagvat Gita? As Mr. Kimura points out the doctrine of every school of Buddhism is mainly concerned at least with three doctrines: (1) Those which deal with cosmic existence; (2) Those which deal with Buddhology; and (3) Those which deal with conception of human life. Mahayana is no

<sup>1</sup> On the whole subject see—A Historical study of the terms Hinayana and Mahayana and the origin of Mahayana Buddhism—by Ryukan Kimura, Cal. University 1927.

<sup>2</sup> This is if the date of Buddha's death is taken to be 543 B.C. and would be 277 B.C. if the date of his death is taken to be 453 B.C.

exception to this. Except probably on Buddhology the Mahayanists could hardly use the Bhagvat Gita to draw upon. So different is the approach of the two on the other doctrines and even this possibility is excluded by the factor of time.

The foregoing discussion completely destroys the only argument that could be urged against my thesis—namely that the Bhagvat Gita is very ancient, pre-Buddhistic in origin and therefore could not be related to Jaimini's Purva Mimansa and treated as an attempt to give a philosophic defence of his counter-revolutionary doctrines.

To sum up, my thesis is three-fold. In other words it has three parts. First is that the Bhagvat Gita is fundamentally a counter-revolutionary treatise of the same class as Jamini's Purva Mimansa—the official Bible of counter-revolution. Some writers relying on verses 40-46 of Chapter II hold the view that the Bhagvat Gita is

*(In all the copies available with us, the essay has been left here incomplete, as is seen from the above sentence—Editors.)*



## Analytical Notes of Virat Parva & Udyog Parva

### VIRAT PARVA

1. The spies sent by Kauravas to search for the existence of the Pandavas return to Duryodhan and tell him that they are unable to discover them. They ask his permission as to what to do.—Virat Parva, Adhya. 25.

2. Duryodhan asks for advice from his advisers. Karna said send other spies. Dushasan said they might have gone beyond the sea. But search for them.—*Ibid.* —Adhya. 26.

3. Drona said the Pandavas are not likely to be defeated or destroyed. They may be living as Tapasis. therefore send Siddhas and Brahmins as spies—*Ibid.* Adhya 27.

4. Bhishma supports Drona—*Ibid* Adhya. 28.

5. Kripacharya supported Bhishma and added—Pandavas are great enemies. But wise man does not neglect even small enemies. While they are in *Agyatavasa* you should go on collecting armies from now.—*Ibid* Adhya. 29.

6. Then Susharma King of Trigarth raised quite a different subject. He said that *Kichaka* who was the *Senapati* of King Virat I hear dead, King Virat is to give us great trouble. Kichaka having been dead Virat must have become very weak. Why not invade the Kingdom of Virat? This is the most opportune time. Karna also supported Susharma. Why worry about the Pandavas, these Pandavas are without wealth, without army and fallen. Why bother with them? They might have even been dead by now. Give up the search and let undertake the project of Susharma—*Ibid* Adhya. 30.

7. Susharma's invasion of Virat. Susharma carries away the cows of Virat. The cow herds go and inform Virat of this and ask him to pursue Susharma and rescue the cows.—*Ibid* Adhya. 31.

8. Virat became ready for war. In the meanwhile *Shatanik* the younger brother of Virat suggested that instead of going alone he

might take with him Kank (Sahadeo) Ballava (Yudhishtira) Santipal (Bhima) and Granthik (Nakula) to help him to fight Susharma. Virat agreed and they all went—*Ibid*. Adhya. 31.

9. War between Shusharma and Virat—*Ibid* Adhya. 32.

10. Yudhishtira rescues Virat.—*Ibid*. Adhya. 33.

11. Announcement in the Virat Nagari that their King is safe.—*Ibid* Adhya. 34.

## ENTRY IN VIRAT NAGARI BY KAURVAS

12. While King Virat went after Susharman Duryodhan with *Bhishma, Drona, Karna, Krapa, Ashvashtama, Shakuni, Dushashana, Vivinshati, Vikarna, Chitrasen, Durmukha, Dushala* and other warriors entered the Virat Nagari and captured the cows of Virat and were going away. The cowherds came to the palace of King Virat and gave the news. They need not find the King but they found his son *Uttar*. so they gave him the news.—*Ibid* Adhya. 35.

13. *Uttar* began to boast saying he was superior to Arjuna and would do the job. But his complaint was that there was no one to act his *Sarathi*. *Draupadi* went and told him that *Brahannada* was at one time the *Sarathi* of Arjuna. Why not ask him? He said he had no courage and requested *Draupadi* to make the request. Why not ask your younger sister *Manorama*. So he told *Manorama* to bring *Brahannada*—*Ibid* Adhya. 36.

14. *Manorama* takes *Brahannada* to his brothers and *Uttara* persuades him to be his *Sarathi*. *Brahannada* agreed and took the Rath of *Uttara* in front of the *Kauravas*—*Ibid*. Adhya. 37.

15. On seeing the army of the *Kauravas* *Uttara* left the Rath and started running away. Arjuna stopped him. The *Kauravas* seeing this began to suspect that the man might be Arjuna. Arjuna told him not to be afraid—*Ibid* Adhya. 38.

16. Arjuna took his *Ratha* to the *Shami* tree. Seeing this *Drona* said he must be Arjuna. Hearing this the *Kauravas* were greatly upset. But *Duryodhana* said if *Drona* is right it is good for us. Because it is before the thirteenth year that the *Pandavas* will have been discovered and they will have to suffer *Vanavas* again for 12 years.—*Ibid* Adhya. 39.

17. Arjuna asks *Uttara* to climb the *Shami* tree and to take down the weapons.—*Ibid* Adhya. 40.

18. *Uttara's* doubts about the corpse on the *Shami* Tree—*Ibid* Adhya. 41.

19. *Uttara's* excitement after seeing the weapons—*Ibid* Adhya. 42.

20. Arjuna's description of the weapons.—*Ibid* Adhya. 43.

21. Uttara's Inquiry regarding the whereabouts about the Pandavas.—*Ibid* Adhya. 44.

22. Climbing down of Uttara from the tree—*Ibid* Adhya. 45.

23. The Rath with Vanar Symbol. Drona becomes sure that he is Arjuna. Bad omens seen by the army of the Kauravas.—*Ibid* Adhya. 46.

24. Duryodhan encourages the soldiers who were frightened by Drona's saying that it was Arjuna. Karna's slander of Drona and proposal to Duryodhan to remove Drona as a Commander-in-Chief.—*Ibid* Adhya. 47.

25. Boasting by Karna and Pratijna to defeat Arjuna—*Ibid* Adhya. 48.

26. Krapacharya's admonition to Karna not to brag and boast. War is regarded as bad by the Shastras—*Ibid* Adhya. 49.

27. Ashvashthama abuses Karna and Duryodhan because of their slander of Drona—*Ibid* Adhya. 50.

28. Ashvashthama abused Karna and Duryodhan for speaking ill of Drona. Karna replied, 'after all I am only a Suta.' But Arjuna has behaved as bad as Rama behaved towards Vali—*Ibid* Adhya. 50.

29. Ashvashthama was quieted by Bhishma, Drona and Krapa, Duryodhan and Karna tendered apology to Drona—*Ibid* Adhya. 51.

30. Bhishma's decision that the Pandavas have completed 13 years.—*ibid* Adhya. 52.

31. Arjuna has defeated the army of the Kauravas.—*Ibid* Adhya. 53.

32. Arjuna defeats Karna's *Bhrata*. Arjuna defeats Karna and Karna runs away—*Ibid* Adhya. 54.

33. Arjuna destroys the army of the Kauravas and breaks the Rath of Kripacharya—*Ibid* Adhya. 55.

34. Gods came out in heaven to witness the fight between Arjuna and the army of the Kauravas—*Ibid* Adhya. 56.

35. Battle between Krapa and Arjuna and the running away of Krapa.—*Ibid* Adhya. 57.

36. Battle between Drona and Arjuna and running away of Drona.—*Ibid* Adhya. 58.

37. Battle between Ashvashthama and Arjuna—*Ibid* Adhya. 59.

38. Battle between Karna and Arjuna, defeat of Karna—Adhya. 60.

39. Attack on Bhishma by Arjuna—*Ibid* Adhya. 61.

40. Arjuna kills the Kauravas soldiers—*Ibid* Adhya. 62.

41. Defeat of Bhishma and his running away from the Battle-field—*Ibid* Adhya. 64.

42. Fainting of the soldiers of the Kauravas. Bhishmas telling them to return home.—*Ibid* Adhya. 66.

43. Kaurava soldiers surrendering to Arjuna from *Abhay*. Uttar and Arjuna return to Virat Nagari—*Ibid* Adhya. 67.

44. Virat enters his capital and his people honouring him.—*Ibid* Adhya. 68.

45. The Pandavas enter the King's Assembly.—*Ibid* Adhya. 69.

46. Arjuna introduces his other brothers in Virat.—*Ibid* Adhya. 71.

47. Marriage between Arjuna's son and the daughter of Virat.—*Ibid* Adhya. 72.

48. Thereafter the Pandavas leave Virat Nagari and live in Upaplowya Nagari—*Ibid* Adhya. 72.

49. Arjuna thereafter brought his son Abhimanyu, Vasudev, and Yadav from Anrut Desh—*Ibid* Adhya. 72.

50. Friends of Yudhisthir such as Kings Kashiraj and Shalya came with two Akshauhini army. Similarly Yagyasen Drupadraj came with one Akshauhini. Draupadi's all sons Ajinkya, Shikhandi, Drustadumna also came.—*Ibid* 72.

## UDYOGAPARVA

1. After the marriage of Abhimanyu the Yadavas and the Pandavas met in the Sabha of King Virat. Krishna addresses them as to what is to be done about the future. We must do what is good both Kauravas and Pandavas. Dharma will accept anything—even one villaga—by *Dharma*. Even if he is given the whole kingdom by Duryodhana he will not accept it. Upto now the Pandavas have observed *Niti*. But if the Kauravas observe *Aniti* the Pandavas will not hesitate to kill the Kauravas. Let nobody be afraid on account of the fact that the Pandavas are a minority. They have many friends who will come to their rescue. We must try to know the wishes of the Kauravas. I suggest that we should send a messenger to Duryodhan and ask him to give part of the Kingdom to the Pandavas.—Udyog Parva, Adhya. 1.

2. Balaram supports the proposal of Krishna but added that it was the fault of Dharma knowing that he was losing at the hands of Shakuni. Therefore instead of fighting with the Kauravas get what you can by negotiation.—*Ibid*, Adhya. 2.

3. Satyaki got up and condemned Balaram for his attitude—*Ibid*, Adhya. 3.

4. Drupad supports Satyaki. Drupad agrees to send his Purohit as a messenger—*Ibid*, Adhya. 4.

5. Krishna supports Drupad and goes to Dwarka. Kings invited by Drupad and Virat arrive. Similarly Kings invited by Duryodhan arrive.—*Ibid*, Adhya. 5.

6. Drupada instructs his purohit how to speak in the assembly and deal with the issue.—*Ibid* Adhya. 6.

7. Arjuna and Duryodhana both go to Dwarka to ask for his aid in the war. He said I will help you both. I can give my army to one and I can join one singly. Choose what you want. Duryodhan chose the army. Arjuna choose Krishna.—*Ibid* Adhya. 7.

8. Coming of Shalya to the Pandavas with a large army. Duryodhan thinks him lower. Meeting of Shalya and Pandavas. Pandavas request Shalya to discourage Karna in the war. Agreement of Shalya.—*Ibid*. Adhya. 8.

9. Adhya. 9—Irrelevant.

10. Adhya. 10—Irrelevant.

11. Adhya. 11—Irrelevant.

12. Adhya. 12—Irrelevant.

13. Adhya. 13—Irrelevant.

14. Adhya. 14—Irrelevant.

15. Adhya. 15—Irrelevant.

16. Adhya. 16—Irrelevant.

17. Adhya. 17—Irrelevant.

18. Adhya. 18—Irrelevant.

19. Adhya—Satyaki comes to Pandvas with his army and Bhagadatta went to Duryodhana.

20. Adhya. 20—The Purohit of Drupada enters the Kauravas Sabha. The Purohit said that the Pandvas are prepared to part evil deeds of the Kauravas and make a compromise with them. He told them that the Pandavas have a large army yet they wish to compromise.

21. Adhya. 21—Bhishma supports the Purohit. Karna objects. Dispute between Bhishma and Karna. Dhratrarashtra suggests that Sanjaya be sent for negotiation on their behalf.

22. Adhya. 22—Dhratrarashtra sends Sanjaya to go to the Pandvas and give his blessings and say what you think best for the occasion and which will not advance enmity between the two.

23. Adhya. 23—Sanjaya's going to the Pandvas.

24. Adhya. 24—Conversation between Sanjaya and Yudhistira.

25. Adhya. 25—Sanjaya condemns war.

26. Adhya. 26—Dharma says 'I am prepared to compromise if the Kauravas give us our Kingdom of Indraprastha.

27. Adhya. 27—It is *Adharma* to kill *Gurujan* and obtain a Kingdom. If the Kauravas refuse to give you any kingdom without war you had better live by begging in the Kingdom of Vrishni and Andhakas.

28. Adhya. 28—Says, Dharma Blame us Sanjaya if you think we have acted or acting against Dharma. Sanjaya says I want Swadharma or Sama.

29. Adhya. 29—Krishna's address to Sanjaya why war is legitimate and asks him to go and tell his views to Dhratarashtra.

30. Adhya. 30—Sanjaya returns to Kauravas and tells Duryodhana to war. Duryodhan either to return Indraprastha to the Pandavas or be ready for war.

31. Adhya. 30—Sanjaya tells Duryodhan to live and let live. If he cannot give Indraprastha let him give us five villages.

32. Adhya. 31—Sanjaya reaches Dhratarashtra at night and tells him I will give you the message of Dharma in the morning.

33. Adhya. 32—Dhratarashtra is uneasy and wants to know the message Sanjaya brought. So he sends for Sanjaya immediately. Sanjaya gives him the message and says settle the dispute by giving them their share of the Kingdom.

34. Adhya. 34—Dhratarashtra calls for Vidura and asks his advice. His advice is, give the Pandavas their portion of the Kingdom.

35. Adhya. 35—Irrelevant.

36. Adhya. 36—Irrelevant. Vidur says make the two sides friends.

37. Adhya. 37—Irrelevant.

38. Adhya. 38—Irrelevant.

39. Adhya. 39—Dhratarashtra tells Vidura I cannot give up Duryodhan although he is bad.

40. Adhya. 40—Vidura describes Chaturvarna.

41. Adhya. 41—Dhratarashtra asks Vidur about Brahma. He says I can't because I am a Shudra. Then comes Sanat-Sujata.

42. Adhya. 42—Conversation between Dhratarashtra & Sanat Sujata on Brahma Vidya.

43. Adhya. 43—Dialogue between Sanat Sujat and Dhratarashtra on the same subject.

44. Adhya. 44—Sanat Sujata on Brahma Vidya.

45. Adhya. 45—Sanat Sujata preaches yoga.

46. Adhya. 46—Sanat Sujat on Atma.

47. Adhya. 47—Kauravas come to the Sabha to hear the message brought by Sanjaya.

48. Adhya. 48—Sanjaya delivers the message. (Particularly that part which was given by Arjuna?)

49. Adhya. 49—Praise of Arjuna & Krishna by Bhishma. Kama gets angry. Drona supports Bhishma and advices compromise.

50. Adhya. 50—Dhratarashtra asks Sanjaya who are the allies of the Pandvas & their strength. Sanjaya taunts, gets up answers.

51. Adhya. 51—Dhratarashtra thinks of the prowess of Bhismna and sighs.

52. Adhya. 52—Dhratarashtra thinks of the prowess of Arjuna and sighs.

53. Adhya. 53—Dhratarashtra thinks of the prowess of Dharma and his friends. He tells his sons to compromise with the Pandavas.

54. Adhya. 54—Sanjaya predicts the defeat of the Kauravas.

55. Adhya. 55—Duryodhan says Pandavas cannot defeat us because our forces are greater.

56. Adhya. 56—Sanjaya describes the disposition of the army made by the Pandavas.

57. Adhya. 57—Sanjaya describes how Pandavas have designed to kill the warriors of the Kauravas. Duryodhan says he is not afraid of the Pandvas defeating the Kauravas who have a larger army.

58. Adhya. 58—Dhratarashtra tells Duryodhan not to fight. Duryodhan takes oath not to swerve from battle. Dhratarashtra weeps.

59. Adhya. 59—Dhratarashtra tells Sanjaya to tell him what conversation took place between Krishna & Arjuna.

60. Adhya. 60—Dhratarashtra tells Duryodhan that the Devas will help the Pandavas and will ruin the Kauravas.

61. Adhya. 61—Duryodhan says he is not afraid of that.

62. Adhya. 62—Karna says he alone is capable of killing Arjuna.

63. Adhya. 63—Duryodhan says he is fighting relying on Karna & not on Bhishma, Drona etc.

64. Adhya. 64—Vidura tells Duryodhan give up enmity.

65. Adhya. 65—Dhratarashtra admonishes Duryodhan.

66. Adhya. 66—Sanjaya tells Dhratarashtra the message of Arjuna.

67. Adhya. 67—The kings who had assembled in the hall of the Kauravas return to their homes. Vyas and Gandhari come with Vidur. Vyas told Sanjaya to tell Dhratarashtra every thing he knows about the real Swarup of Krishna & Arjuna.

68. Adhya. 68—Sanjaya tells Dhratarashtra about Krishna.

69. Adhya. 69—Dhratarashtra tells Duryodhan to surrender to Krishna. Refusal of Duryodhan. Gandhari abuses Duryodhan.

70. Adhya 70—Different names of Krishna & their origin.

71. Adhya 71—Dhratarashtra surrenders to Krishna.

72. Adhya. 72—Conversation between Yudhistira and Krishna. Yudhistir says Sanjaya told him not to rely on Dhratarashtra. Yudhistir stresses the importance of property. Speaks of (Kshatradharma) & the necessity of observing it. Krishna proposes to go to the Kauravas. Yudhistir does not like the idea but says to what you think is the best.

73. Adhya. 73—Krishna tells Dharma the secret which has in mind. Don't use soft speech with the Pandvas tells Krishna to Dharma. There are plenty of reasons why you should not make any compromise with the Kauravas. Emphasizes how the Kauravas disgraced Draupadi. Therefore Oh; Dharma do not hesitate to kill them.

74. Adhya. 74—Bhishma tells Krishna to use soft speech with the Kauravas.

75. Adhya. 75—Krishna redicules Bhima.

76. Adhya. 76—Bhima makes up his mind to fight.

77. Adhya. 77—Krishna tells Bhima the difference between *Daiva* and *Paurush*.

78. Adhya. 78—Arjuna tells Krishna to adopt Shama—failing war can be considered.

79. Adhya. 79—Krishna's talk to Arjun. I will try to bring about a settlement by peace. If that is not possible be ready for war. I will not communicate to Duryodhan Dharma's willingness to accept five villages.

80. Adhya. 80—Nakul tells Krishna to do the best.

81. Adhya. 81—Sahadev meets Krishna and tells him to bring about a war with the Kauravas. Satyaki said that all warriors assembled here agree with the view of Sahadeo.

82. Adhya. 82—Draupadi meets Krishna & tells him that she will not be satisfied unless Duryodhan is punished. Krishna gives her assurance.

83. Adhya. 83—Last meeting between Arjuna and Krishna. Arjuna makes the best effort for *Shama*. Yudhishtir tells Krishna to give assurances to Kunti. Krishna starts on his mission.

84. Adhya. 84—Good & Bad omens to Krishna on his way to Hastinapura.

85. Adhya. 85—Duryodhana creates Resting places for Krishna's journey to Hastinapur. Krishna arrives in Hastinapura.

86. Adhya. 86—Dhratarashtra tells Vidura what gifts are to be offered to Krishna.

87. Adhya. 87—Vidur tells Dhratarashtra that he cannot separate Krishna from the Pandavas.

88. Adhya. 88—Duryodhan says Krishna is worship. But this is not the time to worship him. Bhishma tells Duryodhan to make a compromise with Pandavas. Duryodhan desires to look up Krishna. Bhishma's strong opposition to Duryodhana.

89. Adhya. 89—Krishna's entry into Hastinapur. Meeting with Dhratarashtra. His stay with Vidura.

90. Adhya. 90—Meeting between Kunti and Krishna—Kunti's



sorrow. Krishna consoles her. Kunti tells Krishna— (1) Tell my sons to fight for their kingdom. (2) I am sorry for Draupadi.

91. Adhya. 91—Kauravas invite Krishna to dinner. Krishna's refusal. Krishna goes for meal to Vidur.

92. Adhya. 92—Vidur tells Krishna that he does not like his going among the Kauravas.

93. Adhya. 93—Krishna tells Vidura not all the Kauravas can hurt him. I have come only because *Shama* is Punnyakarak.

94. Adhya. 94—Krishna enters the assembly Hall of the Kauravas.

95. Adhya. 95—Krishna's address to the Assembly. He told them pandavas are ready for both peace as well as war. Give them half their kingdom.

96. Adhya. 96—Jamadgni tells a story against arrogance.

97. Adhya. 97-105—Matali Akhyan.

98. Adhya. 106—Narada's advice to Duryodhana.

99. Adhya. 106-123—Galava Akhyan.

100. Adhya. 124—Dratarashtra tells Krishna to advise Duryodhana.

101. Adhya. 125—Bhishma's advice to Duryodhan. Drona's support. Vidura's condemnation of Duryodhana. Dhratarashtra's advice.

102. Adhya. 126—Bhishma & Drona advice Duryodhana a second time.

103. Adhya. 127—Duryodhana announces not to give anything to the Pandavas.

104. Adhya. 128—Krishna condemns Duryodhana. Duryodhan leaves the Assembly. Dushyasana's speech. Krishna warns Bhishma.

104. Adhya. 129—Dhratarashtra asks Vidur to bring Gandhari to the Assembly. Duryodhan comes back—Gandhari asks him to give half the Kingdom to Pandavas.

104. Adhya. 130—Duryodhana leaves the assembly. His intention to kill Krishna. Satyaki informs Dhratarashtra of this secret plot. Srikrishna's speech. Dhratarashtra calls back Duryodhana to the assembly, warns him. Vidur's condemnation.

105. Adhya. 131—*Bhagwana's Vishwarup Darshan* Dhratarashtra gets *Divya Chakshu*? Krishna leaves the assembly and goes to Kunti.

106. Adhya. 132—Krishna tells Kunti what happened in the assembly. Kunti tells Krishna war is natural to Kshatriyas. There is no better Dharma than that.

107. Adhya. 133—Kunti tells Krishna the story of Vidula to reinforce her point.

108. Adhya. 134—Vidula's story.

109. Adhya. 135—Vidula's story.

110. Adhya. 136—Vidula's story.

111. Adhya. 137—Kunti's advice to her sons. Krishna's advice to Karna and his departure to *Upapalavya Nagari*.

112. Adhya. 138—Advice to Duryodhana by Bhishma & Drona.

113. Adhya. 139—Bhishma's sorrow. Drona again advises Duryodhana.

114. Adhya. 140—Conversation between Dhrtarashtra and Sanjaya. Krishna advises Karna.

115. Adhya. 141—Karna's reply to Krishna.

116. Adhya. 142—Krishna's assurance to Karna that the Pandava's will win.

117. Adhya. 143—Karna sees bad omens. His determination to finish Pandavas. His going home.

118. Adhya. 144—Conversation between Vidura and Pratha. Knows Duryodhana is determined to fight. Kunti's sorrow. Her wish to tell Karna his origin. Kunti goes to the bank of the river.

119. Adhya. 145—Kunti meets Karna and tells him his origin and request him to join the Pandavas.

120. Adhya. 146—Surya supports the proposal of Kunti. Karna rejects it. Promises to save all the Pandavas except Arjuna.

121. Adhya. 147—Krishna goes to Pandavas. Yudhistir asks what happened in the Kaurava Sabha.

122. Adhya. 147, 148, 149, 150—Krishna relates the whole story.

123. Adhya. 151—Appointment of Senapati for the Pandavas Army. Entry of Pandava's Army in Kurushetra.

124. Adhya. 152—Description of Pandavas arrangement for supply to the Army.

125. Adhya. 153—Arrangement on Kaurava's side. Our army must enter Kurushetra tomorrow early morning.

126. Adhya. 154—Dharma's fear of fall from his moral rectitude by going to war. Krishna satisfied him. Arjuna said you must fight.

127. Adhya. 155—Description of Duryodhan's army.

128. Adhya. 156—Bhishma is made Senapati of the Kaurava's army. Karna is offended. His decision not to take command till Bhishma is dead. Kaurava's *Army enters Kurushetra*.

129. Adhya. 157—Krishna becomes commander of Pandava's Army.

130. Balram goes on Pilgrimage saying I do not like the Kauravas destroyed.

131. Adhya. 158—Rukmi neither wanted by Arjuna nor by Duryodhana goes home.

132. Adhya. 159—Conversation between Sanjaya and Dhrtarashtra. He blames Dhrtarashtra.

133. Adhya. 160—Pandava's Army on the bank of the *Hiranyavati* river. Duryodhan sends offensive messages to Pandavas and Krishna saying fight if you can.

134. Adhya. 161. Uluka goes with the messages.

135. Adhya. 162—Angry Pandavas send back angry messages. They give order that the war will start tomorrow.

□ □

# CHAPTER 15

## Brahmins Versus Kshatriyas

*This manuscript consists of 43 foolscap typed pages. All the loose pages are tagged. The original title, 'Brahmins and Kshatriyas and the Counter-Revolution' has been modified in Dr. Ambedkar's hand-writing as 'Brahmins Versus Kshatriyas' on the title page. The essay seems to be complete.—Editors.*

The sacred literature of the Hindus contains many cases of conflicts between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas and even of sanguinary wars between the two.

The first case reported was that of the King Vena. Vena was a Kshatriya King. His conflict with the Brahmins has been referred to in various authorities. The following account is taken from the Harivansa.

"<sup>1</sup>There was formerly a Prajapati (lord of creatures), a protector of righteousness, called Anga, of the race of Atrai, and resembling him in power. His son was the Prajapati Vena, who was but indifferently skilled in duty, and was born of Sunitha, the daughter of Mrityu. This son of the daughter of Kala (Death), owing to the taint derived from his maternal grand-father, threw his duties behind his back, and lived in covetousness under the influence of desire. This king established an irreligious system of conduct; transgressing the ordinances of the Veda, he was devoted to lawlessness. In his reign men lived without study of the sacred books and without the Vashatkara, and the gods had no some-libations to drink at sacrifices."

No sacrifice or oblation shall be offered,—such was the ruthless determination of that Prajapati, as the time of his destruction approached. 'I', he declared, 'am the object, and the performer of sacrifice, and the sacrifice itself; it is to me that sacrifice should be presented, and oblations offered.' This transgressor of the rules of duty, who arrogated to himself what was not his due, was then

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, p. 302-303.

addressed by all the great Rishis, headed by Marichi: "We are about to consecrate ourselves for a ceremony which shall last for many years; practise not unrighteousness, of Vena; this is not the eternal rule of duty. Thou art in every deed a Prajapati of Atri's race and thou hast engaged to protect thy subject.' The foolish Vena, ignorant of what was right, laughingly answered those great Rishis who had so addressed him: "Who but myself is the ordainer of duty? or whom ought I to obey? Who on earth equals me in sacred knowledge, in process, in austere fervour, in truth? Ye who are deluded and senseless know not that I am the source of all beings and duties. Hesitate not to believe that I, if I willed, could turn up the earth, or deluge it with water, or close up heaven and earth.' When owing to his delusion and arrogance Vena could not be governed, then the mighty Rishis becoming licensed, seized the vigorous and struggling king, and rubbed his left thigh. From this thigh, so rubbed, was produced a black man, very short in stature, who, being alarmed, stood with joined hands. Seeing that he was agitated, Atri said to him 'Sit down' (Nishida). He became the founder of the race of the Nishadas, and also progenitor of the Dhivaras (Fishermen), who sprang from the corruption of Vena.'

The second case is that of Pururavas. Pururavas is another Kshatriya King, son of Ila and grandson of Manu Vaivasvata. He came in conflict with the Brahmins the following account of which appears in the Adi Parva of the Mahabharata:

"<sup>1</sup>Subsequently the wise Pururavas was born of Ila who, as we have heard was both his father and his mother. Ruling over thirteen islands of the ocean, and surrounded by beings who were all superhuman, himself a man of great renown, Pururavas, intoxicated by his prowess, engaged in a conflict with the Brahmins, and robbed them of their jewels, although they loudly remonstrated. Sanatkumara came from Brahma's heaven, and addressed to him an admonition, which however, he did not regard. Being then straightway cursed by the incensed Rishis, he perished, this covetous monarch, who, through piece of power, had lost his understanding."

The third and a somewhat serious conflict was that between King *Nahusha* and the Brahmins. *Nahusha* is the grandson of Pururavas. The story is told in two places in the Mahabharata once in the Vanaparvan and a second time in the Udyogaparvan. The following account is taken from the Udyogaparvan of the Mahabharata:

"<sup>2</sup>After his slaughter of the demon Vritta, Indra became alarmed at the idea of having taken the life of a Brahman (for Vritta was

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, p. 307.

<sup>2</sup> Muir Vol. I, p. 310-313.

regarded as such) and hid himself in the waters. In consequence of the disappearance of the king of the gods, all affairs, celestial as well as terrestrial, fell into confusion. The Rishis and gods then applied to Nahusha to be their king. After the first excusing himself on the plea of want of power, Nahusha at length, in compliance with their solicitations, accepted the high function. Upto the period of his elevation he had led a virtuous life, but he now became addicted to amusement and sensual pleasure, and even aspired to the possession of Indrani, Indra's wife, whom he had happened to see. The queen resorted to the Angiras Vrihaspati, the preceptor of the gods, who engaged to protect her. Nahusha was greatly incensed on hearing of this interference; but the gods endeavoured to pacify him, and pointed out the immorality of appropriating another person's wife. Nahusha, however, would listen to no remonstrance, and insisted that in his adulterous designs he was no worse than Indra himself."

"The renowned Ahalya, a rishi's wife, was formerly corrupted by Indra in her husband's lifetime. Why was he not prevented by you? And many barbarous acts, and unrighteous deeds, and frauds were perpetrated of old by Indra; Why was he not prevented by you?" The gods, urged Nahusha, then went to bring Indrani; but Vrihaspati would not give her up. At his recommendation, however, she solicited Nahusha for some delay, till she should ascertain what had become of her husband. This request was granted." Indrani now went in search of her husband; and by the help of Upasruti (the goddess of night and revealer of secrets) discovered him existing in a very subtle form in the stem of a lotus growing in a lake situated in a continent within an ocean north of the Himalayas. She made known to him the wicked intentions of Nahusha, and entreated him to exert his power, rescue her from danger, and resume his dominion. Indra declined any immediate interposition on the plea of Nahusha's superior strength; but suggested to his wife a device by which the usurper might be hurled from his position. She was recommended to say to Nahusha that "if he would visit her on a celestial vehicle borne by Rishis, she would with pleasure submit herself to him."

"I desire for thee, king of the gods, a vehicle hitherto unknown, such as neither Vishnu, nor Rudra, nor the Asuras, nor the Rakshases employ. Let the eminent Rishis, all united, bear thee, lord, in a car: this idea pleases me." Nahusha receives favourably this appeal to his vanity, and in the course of his reply thus gives utterance to his self-congratulation: "He is a personage of no mean prowess who makes the Munis his bearers. I am a fervid devotee of

great might, lord of the past, the future, and the present. If I were angry the world would no longer stand; on me everything depends..... Wherefore, O goddess, I shall, without doubt, carry out what you propose. The seven Rishis, and all the Brahman-rishis, shall carry me. Behold, beautiful goddess, my majesty and my prosperity." The narrative goes on: "Accordingly this wicked being, irreligious, violent, intoxicated by the force of conceit, and arbitrary in his conduct, attached to his car the Rishis who submitted to his command, and compelled them to bear him." Indrani then again resorts to Vrihaspati, who assures her that vengeance will soon overtake Nahusha for his presumption, and promises that he will himself perform a sacrifice with a view to the destruction of the oppressor, and the discovery of Indra's lurking place. Agni is then sent to discover and bring Indra to Vrihaspati; and the latter, on Indra's arrival, informs him of all that had occurred during his absence. While Indra, with Kuvera, Yama, Soma and Varuna was devising means for the destruction of Nahusha, the sage Agastya came up, congratulated Indra on the fall of his rival, and proceeded to relate how it had occurred:

"Wearied with carrying the sinner Nahusha the eminent divine-rishis, and the spotless Brahman-rishis, asked that divine personage Nahusha (to solve) a difficulty; "Dost thou, O Vasava, most excellent of conquerors, regard as authoritative or not those Brahmana texts which are recited at the immolation of kine?" "No", replied Nahusha, whose understanding was enveloped in darkness. The Rishis rejoined: 'Engaged in unrighteousness, thou attainest not unto righteousness: these texts, which were formerly uttered by great Rishis, are regarded by us as authoritative.' Then (proceeds Agastya) disputing with the Munis, Nahusha, impelled by unrighteousness, touched me on the head with his foot. In consequence of this the king's glory was smitten and his prosperity departed. When he had instantly become agitated and oppressed with fear, I said to him, 'Since thou, O fool, contemnest that sacred text, always held in honour, which has been composed by former sages, and employed by Brahman-rishis, and has touched my head with thy foot, and employest the Brahma—like the irresistible Rishis as bearers to carry thee,—therefore, shorn of thy lusture, and all thy merit exhausted, sink down, sinner, degraded from heaven to earth. For ten thousand years thou shalt crawl in the form of a huge serpent. When that period is completed, thou shalt again ascend to heaven.' So fell that wicked wretch from the sovereignty of the gods. Happily, O Indra, we shall now prosper, for the enemy of the

Brahmans has been smitten. Take possession of the three worlds, and protect their inhabitants, O husband of Sachi (Indrani) subduing thy senses, overcoming thine enemies, and celebrated by the great Rishis."

The fourth case is of King Nimi. Nimi was one of the sons of Ikshvaku. The facts of his conflict with the Brahmans are related in the Vishnu Purana which says:

"<sup>1</sup>Nimi had requested the Brahman Rishi Vashistha to officiate at a sacrifice, which was to last a thousand years. Vashistha in reply pleaded a pre-engagement to Indra for five hundred years, but promised to return at the end of that period. The king made no remark, and Vashistha went away, supposing that he had assented to his arrangement. On his return, however, the priest discovered that Nimi had retained Gautama (who was, equally with Vashistha, a Brahmin-rishi) and others to perform the sacrifice; and being incensed at the neglect to give him notice of what was intended, he cursed the king, who was then asleep, to lose his corporeal form. When Nimi awoke and learnt that he had been cursed without any previous warning, he retorted by uttering a similar curse on Vashistha, and then died. Nimi's body was emblamed. At the close of the sacrifice which he had begun, the gods, were willing, on the intercession of the priests, to restore him to life, but he declined the offer; and was placed by the deities, according to his desire, in the eyes of all living creatures. It is in consequence of this that they are always opening and shutting (nimisha means "The twinkling of the eye").

The fifth case relates to the conflict between Vashishtha and Vishvamitra. Vashishtha was a Brahmin priest. Vishvamitra was a Kshatriya. His great ambition was to become a Brahmin. The following episode reported from the Ramayana explains the reasons why he became anxious to become a Brahmin.

"<sup>2</sup>There was formerly, we are told, a king called Kusa, son of Prajapati, who had a son called Kusanabha, who was father of Gadhi, the father of Vishvamitra. The latter ruled the earth for many thousand years. On one occasion, when he was making a circuit of the earth, he came to Vashishtha's hermitage, the pleasant abode of many saints, sages, and holy devotees, where, after all first declining, he allowed himself to be hospitably entertained with his followers by the son of Brahma. Vishvamitra, however, coveting the wonderful cow, which had supplied all the dainties of the feast, first

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 316.

<sup>2</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 397-400.



of all asked that she should be given to him in exchange for a hundred thousand common cows, adding that "she was a gem, that gems were the property of the King, and, therefore, the cow owes his by right." On this price being refused, the King advances immensely in his offers, but all without effect. He then proceeds very ungratefully, and tyrannically, it must be allowed—to have the cow removed by force, but she breaks away from his attendants, and rushes back to her master, complaining that he was deserting her. He replies that he was not deserting her, but that the king was much more powerful than he. She answers, 'Men do not ascribe strength to a Kshatriya: the Brahmans are stronger. The strength of Brahmins is divine, and superior to that of Kshatriyas. Thy strength is immeasurable. Vishvamitra, though of great vigour, is not more powerful than thou. Thy energy is invincible. Commission me, who have been acquired by thy Brahmanical power, and I will destroy the pride, and force, and attempt of this wicked prince.' She accordingly by her bellowing creates hundred of Pahalvas, who destroy the entire host of Vishvamitra, but are slain by him in their turn. Sakas and Yavanas, of great power and valour, and well armed, were then produced, who consumed the king's soldiers, but were routed by him. The cow then calls into existence by her bellowing, and from different parts of her body, other warriors of various tribes, who again destroyed Vishvamitra's entire army, foot soldiers, elephants, horses, chariots, and all. A hundred of the monarch's sons, armed with various weapons, then rushed in great fury on Vashishtha, but were all reduced to ashes in a moment by the blast of that sage's mouth. Vishvamitra, being thus utterly vanquished and humbled, appointed one of his sons to be regent, and travelled to the Himalaya, where he betook to austerities, and thereby obtained a vision of Mahadeva, who at his desire revealed to him the science of arms in all its branches, and gave him celestial weapons with which, elated and full of pride, he consumed the hermitage of Vashishtha, and put its inhabitants to flight. Vashishtha then threatens Vishvamitra and uplifts his Brahmanical mace. Vishvamitra, too, raises his fiery weapon and calls out to his adversary to stand. Vashishtha bids him to show his strength and boasts that he will soon humble his pride. He asks: "What comparison is there between a Kshatriya's might and the might of a Brahman? Behold, thou contemptible Kshatriya, my divine Brhmanical power.' The dreadful fiery weapon uplifted by the son of Gadhi was then quenched by the rod of the Brahman, as fire is by water." Many and various other celestial missiles, as the nooses of

Brahma, Kala (Time), and Varuna<sup>1</sup>, the discuss of Vishnu, and the trident of Shiva, were hurled by Vishvamitra at his antagonist, but the son of Brahma swallowed them up in his all-devouring mace. Finally, to the intense consternation of all the gods, the warrior shot off the terrific weapon of Brahma; but this was equally ineffectual against the Brahmanical sage. Vashishtha had now assumed a direful appearance. "Jets of fire mingled with smoke darted from the pores of his body; the Brahmanical mace blazed in his hand like a smokeless mundane conflagration, or a second sceptre of Yama." Being appeased, however, by the munis, who proclaimed his superiority to his rival, the sage stayed his vengeance; and Vishvamitra exclaimed with a groan: "Shame on a Kshatriya's strength: the strength of a Brahman's might alone is strength; by the single Brahmanical mace all my weapons have been destroyed."

No alternative now remains to the humiliated monarch, but either to acquiesce in this help less inferiority, or to work out his own elevation to the Brahmanical order. He embraces the latter alternative: "Having pondered well this defeat, I shall betake myself, with composed senses and mind, to strenuous austere fervour, which shall exalt me to the rank of a Brahman." Intensely vexed and mortified, groaning and full of hatred against his enemy, he travelled with his queen to the south, and carried his resolution into effect. At the end of a thousand years Brahma appeared, and announced that he had conquered the heaven of royal sages (rajarshis): and, in consequence of his austere fervour, he was recognised as having attained that rank."

The conflict seems to have begun in the reign of King Sudas who belonged to the line of Ikshavaku. Vashishtha was the hereditary priest of King Sudas. For some reason which is not very clearly stated Sudas appointed Vishvamitra as his family priest. This brought about a conflict between Vishvamitra and Vashishtha. This conflict once started raged on for a long time.

The conflict between the two took a peculiar turn. If Vishvamitra was involved in a dispute Vashishtha came into the fray and sided with his opponent. If Vishvamitra was involved in dispute Vashishtha entered into fray and sided with Vishvamitra as opponent. It was a case of one persecuting the other.

The first such episode is that of Satyavrata otherwise called Trishanku. The story as told in the Harivamsha is as follows:

"Meanwhile Vashishtha, from the relation subsisting between the King (Satyavrata's father) and himself, a disciple and spiritual

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 377-378.

preceptor, governed the city of Ayodhya, the country, and the interior apartments of the royal palace. But Satyavrata, whether through folly or the force of destiny, cherished constantly an increased indignation against Vashishtha, who for a (proper) reason had not interposed to prevent his exclusion from the royal power by his father. 'The formulas of the marriage ceremonial are only binding,' said Satyavrata, 'when the seventh step has been taken, and this had not been done when I seized the damsel: still Vashishtha, who knows the precepts of the law, does not come to my aid.' Thus Satyavrata was incensed in his mind against Vashishtha, who however, had acted from a sense of what was right. Nor did Satyavrata understand (he propriety of) that silent penance imposed upon him by his father. . . . . When he had supported this arduous rite, (the supposed that) he had redeemed his family position. The venerable muni Vashishtha did not, however, (as has been said) prevent his father from setting him aside, but resolved to install his son as King. When the powerful prince Satyavrata had endured the penance for twelve years, he beheld, when he was without flesh to eat, the milch cow of Vashishtha which yielded all objects of desire; and under the influence of anger; delusion, and exhaustion, distressed by hunger, and failing in the ten duties he slew. . . . . and both partook of her flesh himself, and gave it to Vishvamitra's sons to eat. Vashishtha hearing of this, became incensed against him", and imposed on his the name of Trisanku as he had committed three sins. On his return home, Vishvamitra was gratified by the support which his wife had received, and offered Trisanku the choice of a boon. When this proposal was made, Trisanku chose the boon of ascending bodily to heaven. All apprehension from the twelve year's drought being now at an end, the muni (Vishvamitra) installed Trisanku in his father's kingdom, and offered sacrifice on his behalf. The mighty Kausika then, in spite of the resistance of the gods and of Vashishtha,<sup>1</sup> exalted the king alive to heaven."

2. As stated in the Harivamsa:

"<sup>2</sup>In consequence of the wickedness which had been committed, Indra did not rain for a period of twelve years. At that time Vishvamitra had left his wife and children and gone to practise austerties on the sea-shore. His wife, driven to extremity by want, was on the point of selling her second son for a hundred cows, in

<sup>1</sup> As stated in another place in the Harivamsa Trisanku had been expelled from his home by his father for the offence of carrying off the young wife of one of the citizens under the influence of a criminal passion and Vashishtha did not interfere to prevent his banishment. It is to this that the text refers.

<sup>2</sup> Muir Vol. I. pp. 376-77.

order to support the others; but this arrangement was stopped by the interventions of Satyavrata, who liberated the son when bound, and maintained the family by providing them with the flesh of wild animals; and according to his father's injunction, consecrated himself for the performance of a silent penance for twelve years."

The next episode in which they appear on opposite sides is that of Harishchandra the son of Trisanku. The story is told in the Vishnu Purana and in the Markendeya Purana. This is how the story runs:

"On one occasion, when hunting the king heard a sound of female lamentation which proceeded, it appears, from the sciences who were becoming mastered by the austere fervid sage Vishvamitra, in a way they had never been before by anyone else; and were consequently crying out in alarm at his superiority. In fulfilment of his duty as a Kshatriya to defend the weak, and inspired by the god Ganesha, who had entered into him, Harishchandra exclaimed, "What sinner is this who is binding fire in the hem of his garment, while, I, his lord, am present, resplendent with force and fiery vigour?" He shall to-day enter on his long sleep, pierced in all his limbs by arrows, which, by their discharge from my bow, illuminate all the quarters of the firmament." Vishvamitra was provoked by this address. In consequence of his wrath the Sciences instantly perished, and Harishchandra, trembling like the leaf of an Asvattha tree, submissively represented that he had merely done his duty as a king, which he defined as consisting in the bestowal of gifts on eminent Brahmins and other persons of slender means, the protection of the timid, and war against enemies. Vishvamitra hereupon demands a gift as a Brahman intent upon receiving one. The king offers him whatsoever he may ask: Gold, his own son, wife, body, like kingdom, good fortune. The saint first requires the present for the Rajasuya sacrifice. On this being promised, and still more offered, he asks for the empire of the whole earth, including everything but Harishchandra himself, his wife and son, and his virtue which follows its possessor wherever he goes." "Harishchandra joyfully agrees. Vishvamitra then requires him to strip off all his ornaments, to clothe himself in the bark of trees, and to quit the kingdom with his wife Saviya (Taramati) and his son. When he is departing the sage stops him and demands payment of his yet unpaid sacrificial fee. The king replies that he has only the persons of his wife, his son, and himself left. Vishvamitra insists that he must nevertheless pay; and that "unfulfilled promises of gifts to Brahmins bring destruction." The unfortunate prince, after being threatened with a curse, engages to make the payment in a month;

and commences his journey with a wife unused to such fatigues, amid the universal lamentations of his subjects. While he lingers, listening to their affectionate remonstrances against his desertion of his kingdom, Vishvamitra, comes up and being incensed at the delay and the King's apparent hesitation, strikes the queen with his staff, as she is dragged on by her husband. Harishchandra then proceeded with his wife and little son to Benares, imagining that this divine city, as the special property of Siva, could not be possessed by any mortal. Here he found the relentless Vishvamitr waiting for him, and ready to press his demand for the payment of his sacrificial gift, even before the expiration of the full period of grace. In this extremity Sāivya the queen suggests with a sobbing voice that her husband should sell her. On hearing this proposal Harishchandra swoons, then recovers, utters lamentations, and swoons again, and his wife, seeing his said condition, swoon also. While they are in a state of unconsciousness, their famished child exclaims in distress, "O father, father, give me bread; O mother, mother give me food: hunger overpowers me and my tongue is parched." At this moment Vishvamitra returns, and after recalling Harishchandra to consciousness by spinkling water over him, again urges payment of the present. The king again swoons, and is again restored. The sag threatens to curse him if his engagement is not fulfilled by sunset. Being now pressed by his wife, the King agrees to sell her ading, however, "If my voice can utter such a wicked word, I do not what the most inhuman wretches cannot perpetrate." He then goes into the city and in selfacusing language offers his queen for sale as a slave. A rich old Brahman offers to buy her at a price corresponding to her value, to do his household work. Seeing his mother dragged away, the child ran after her, his eyes dimmed with tears, and crying 'mother'. The Brahman purchaser kicked him when he came up; but he would not let his mother go, and continued crying 'mother, mother.' The queen then said to the Brahman, 'Be so kind, my master, as to but also this child, as without him I shall prove to thee but a useless purchase. Be thus merciful to me in my wretchedness, unite me with my son, like a cow to her calf.' The Brahman agrees: "Take this money and give me the boy." After the Brahman had gone out of sight with his purchases, Vishvamitra again appeared and renewed his demands; and when the afflicted Harishchanda offered him the small sum he had obtained by the sale of his wife and son, he angrily replied, "If, miserable Kshatriya, thou thinkest this a sacrificial gift befitting my deserts, thou shalt soon beheld the transcendent power of my ardent austere fervour, of my spotless

Brahmanhood of my terrible majesty, and of my holy study. Harishchandra promises an additional gift, and Vishvamitra allows him the remaining quarter of the day for its liquidation. On the terrified and afflicted prince offering himself for sale, in order to gain the mean of meeting this cruel demand, Dharma (Righteousness) appears in the form of a hideous and offensive Chandala, and agrees to buy him at his own price, large or small. Harishchandra declines such a degrading servitude, and declares that he would rather be consumed by the fire of his persecutor's curse than submit to such a fate. Vishvamitra however again comes on the scene, asks why he does not accept the large sum offered by the Chandala; and, when he pleads in excuse his descent from the solar race, threatens to fulminate a curse against him if he does not accept that method of meeting his liability. Harishchandra implores that he may be spared this extreme of degradation, and offers to become Vishvamitra's slave in payment of the residue of his debt; whereupon the sage rejoins, "If thou art my slave, then I sell thee as such to the Chandala for a hundred millions of money."

"The Chandala, delighted, pays down the money, and carries off Harishchandra, bound beaten, confused and afflicted, to his own place of abode. Harishchandra is sent by the Chandala to steal grave clothes in a cemetery and is told that he will receive two-sixths going to his masters, and one-sixth to the King. In this horrid spot, and in this degrading occupation, he spent in great misery, twelve months, which seemed to him like a hundred years. He then falls asleep and has a series of dreams suggested by the life he had been leading. After he awoke, his wife came to the cemetery to perform the obsequies of their son, who had died from the bite of a serpent. At first the husband and wife did not recognize each other, from the change in appearance which had been brought upon them by their miseries. Harishchandra however, soon discovered from the tenor of her lamentations that it is his wife, and falls into a swoon; as the queen does also when she recognizes her husband. When consciousness returns, they both break out into lamentations, the father bewailing in a touching strain the loss of his son, and the wife the degradation of the King. She then falls on his neck, embraces him, and asks "whether all this is a dream, or a reality, as she is utterly bewildered", and adds, that "if it be a reality, then righteousness is unavailing to those who practise it." After hesitating to devote himself to death on his son's funeral pyre without receiving his master's leave, Harishchandra resolves to do so, braving all the consequences, and consoling himself with the hopeful

anticipation: "If I have given gifts, and offered sacrifices and gratified my religious teachers, then may I be reunited with my son and with thee (my wife) in another world." The queen determines to die in the same manner. When Harishchandra, after placing his son's body on the funeral pile, is meditating on the Lord Shri Narayan Krishna, the supreme spirit, all the gods arrive, headed by Dharma (righteousness), and accompanied by Vishvamitra. Dharma entreats the king to desist from his rash intention; and Indra announces to him that he, his wife, and son have conquered heaven by their good works. Amrosia, the antidote of death, and flowers are rained by the god from the sky; and the king's son is restored to life and the bloom of youth. The king, adorned with celestial clothing and garlands, and the queen, embrace their son. Harishchandra, however declares that he cannot go to heaven till he has received his master the Chandala's permission, and has paid him a ransom. Dharma then reveals to the king that it was he himself who had miraculously assumed the form of a Chandala. The king next objects that he cannot depart unless his faithful subjects, who are shares in his merits, are allowed to accompany him to heaven, at least for one day. This request is granted by Indra; and after Vishvamitra has inaugurated Rohitasva the king's son to be his successor, Harishchandra, his friends and followers, all ascend in company to heaven. Even after this great consummation, however, Vashishtha, the family-priest of Harishchandra, hearing, at the end of a twelve years' abode in the waters of the Ganges, an account of all that has occurred, becomes vehemently incensed at the humiliation inflicted on the excellent monarch, whose virtues and devotion to the gods and Brahmins he celebrates, declares that his indignation had not been so great roused even when his own hundred sons had been slain by Vishvamitra, and in the following words dooms the latter to be transformed into crane. Wherefore that wicked man, enemy of the Brahmins, smitten by my curse, shall be expelled from the society of intelligent beings, and losing his understanding shall be transformed into a Vaka." Vishvamitra reciprocates the curse, and changes Vashishtha into a bird of the species called Ari. In their new shapes the two have a furious fight, the Ari being of the portentous height of two thousand yojanas = 18,000 miles, and the Vaka of 3090 yojanas. The first assail each other with their wings; then the Vaka smites his antagonist in the same manner, while the Ari strikes with his talons. Falling mountains, overturned by the blasts of wind raised by the flapping of their wings, shake the whole earth, the waters of the ocean

overflow, the earth itself, thrown off its perpendicular slopes downwards patala, the lower regions. Many creatures perish by these various convulsions. Attracted by the dire disorder, Brahma arrives, attended by all the gods, on the spot, and command the comptants to desist from their fray. They were too fiercely infuriated to regard this injunction; but Brahma put an end to the conflict by restoring them to their natural forms, and conselling them to be reconciled.

The next episode in which they came in as opponents is connected with *Ambarish* King of Ayodhya.

<sup>1</sup>The story relates that Ambarisha was engaged in performing a sacrifice, when Indra carried away the victim. The priest said that this ill-omened event had occurred owing to the king's bad administration, and would call for a great expiation, unless a human victim could be produced. After a long search the royal rishi (Ambarisha) came upon the Brahman-rishi Richika, a descendent of Bhrgu, and asked him to sell one of his sons for a victim, at the price of a hundred thousand cows. Richika answered that he would not sell his eldest son; and his wife added that she would not sell the youngest: eldest sons" she observed, "being generally the favourites of their fathers, and youngest sons of their mothers." The second son, Sunassena, then said that in that case he regarded himself as the one who was to be sold, and desired the king to remove him. The hundred thousand cows, with ten millions of gold pieces and heaps of jewels, were paid down, and Sunassepa carried away. As they were passing through Pushkara Sunassepa beheld his maternal uncle Vishvamitra who was engaged in austerities there with other rishis, threw himself into his arms, and implored his assistance, urging his orphan friendless, and helpless state, as claims on the sage's benevolence.

"Vishvamitra soothed him: and pressed his own sons to offer themselves as victim in the room of Sunassepa. This proposition met with no favour from Madhushyanda and the other sons of the royal hermit, who answered with haughtiness and derision: "How is that thou sacrificest thine own sons, and seekest to rescue those of others? We look upon this as wrong, and like the eating of one's own flesh." The sage was exceedingly wroth at this disregard of his injunction, and doomed his sons to be born in the most degraded classes, like Vashishtha's sons, and to eat dog's flesh, for a thousand years. He then said to Sunassepa: "When thou art bound with hallowed cords, decked with a red garland, and annointed with unguents, and fastened to the sacrificial post of Vishnu, then address thyself to Agni, and sing these two divine verses (gathas), at the



sacrifice of Ambarisha ; then shalt thou attain the fulfilment." Being furnished with the two gathas, Sunassepa proposed at once to king Ambarisha that they should set out for their destination. When bound at the stake to be immolated, dressed in a red garment, "he celebrated the two gods, Indra and his younger brother (Vishnu), with the excellent verses. The thousand-eyed (Indra) was pleased with the secret hymn, and bestowed long life on Sunassepa."

The last episode recorded in which the two appear as opponents is connected with King *Kalmashapada*. The episode is recorded in the *Adi Parva* of the *Mahabharata*.

"<sup>1</sup>*Kalmashapada* was a King of the race *Ikshvaku*. *Vishvamitra* wished to be employed by him as his officiating priest; but the king preferred *Vashishtha*." It happened, however, that the king went out to hunt, and after having killed a large quantity of game, he became very much fatigued, as well as hungry and thirsty. Meeting *Saktri*, the eldest of *Vashishtha*'s hundred sons, on the road, he ordered him to get out of his way. The priest civilly replied : "The path is mine, O King; this is the immemorial law; in all observances the king must cede the way to the Brahman." Neither party would yield, and the dispute waxing warmer, the king struck the muni with his whip. The muni, resorting to the usual expedient of offended sages, by a curse doomed the king to become a man eater. "It hapened that at that time enmity existed between *Vishvamitra* and *Vashishtha* on account of their respective claims to be priest to *Kalmashapada*." *Vishvamitra* had followed the king; and approached while he was disputing with *Saktri*. Perceiving, however, the son of his rival *Vashishtha*, *Vishvamitra* made himself invisible, and passed them, watching his opportunity. The king began to implore *Saktri*'s clemency: but *Vishvamitra* wishing to prevent their reconciliation, commanded a *Rakshasa* (a man-devouring demon) to enter into the king. Owing to the conjoint influence of the *Brahma-rishi*'s curse, and *Vishvamitra*'s command, the demon obeyed the injunction. Perceiving that his object was gained, *Vishvamitra* left things to take their course, and absented himself from the country. The king having happened to meet a hungry Brahman, and sent him, by the hand of his cook (who could procure nothing else), some human flesh to eat, was cursed by him also to the same effect as by *Saktri*. The curse, being now augmented in force, took effect, and *Saktri* himself was the first victim, being eaten up by the King. The same fate befell all the other sons of *Vashishtha* at the instigation of *Vishvamitra*. Perceiving *Saktri* to be dead, *Vishvamitra* again and

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 415-417.

again incited the Rakshasa against the sons of Vashishtha; and accordingly the furious demon devoured those of his sons who were younger than Saktri as a lion eats up the small beasts of the forest. On hearing of the destruction of his sons by Vishvamitra, Vashishtha supported his affliction, as the great mountain sustains the earth. He meditated his own destruction, but never thought of exterminating the Kausikas. This divine sage hurled himself from the summit of Meru, but fell upon the rocks as if on a heap of cotton. Escaping alive from his fall, he entered a glowing fire in the forest; but the fire, though fiercely blazing, not only failed to burn him, but seemed perfectly cool. He next threw himself into the sea with a heavy stone attached to his neck; but was cast up by the waves on the dry land. He then went home to his hermitage; but seeing it empty and desolate, he was again overcome by grief and went out; and seeing the river Vipasa which was swollen by the recent rains and sweeping along many trees torn from its banks, he conceived the design of drowning himself into its water, he accordingly tied himself firmly with cords, and threw himself in, but the river severing his bonds, deposited him unbound (vipasa) on dry land; whence the name of the stream, as imposed by the sage. He afterwards saw and threw himself into the dreadful Satadru (Sutlej), which was full of alligators, etc., and derived its name rushing away in a hundred directions on seeing the Brahman brilliant as fire. In consequence of this he was once more stranded; and seeing he could not kill himself, he went back to his hermitage."

There are only particular instances of their general enmity towards each other. This general enmity was of a mortal kind so much so that Vishvamitra wanted even to murder Vashishtha. This is related in the Shalyaparva of the Mahabharata. Says the author of the Mahabharata:

"There existed a great enmity, arising from rivalry in their austerities, between Vishvamitra and the Brahman rishi Vashishtha. Vashishtha had an extensive hermitage in Sthanutirtha, to the east of which was Vishvamitra's. . . . . These two great ascetics were every day exhibiting intense emulation in regard to their respective austerities. But Vishvamitra, beholding the might of Vashishtha, was the most chagrined; and fell into deep thought. The idea of this sage, constant in duty (!) was the following: 'This river Sarasvati will speedily bring to me on her current the austere Vashishtha, the most eminent of all mutterers of prayers. When that most excellent Brahman has come, I shall most assuredly kill him.' Having thus

determined, the divine sage Vishvamitra, his eyes reddened by anger, called to mind the chief of rivers. She being thus the subject of his thoughts, became very anxious, as she knew him to be very powerful and very irascible. Then trembling palid, and with joined hands, the Sarasvati stood before the chief of munis. Like a woman whose husband has been slain, she was greatly distressed; and said to him, 'What shall I do?' The incensed muni replied, 'Bring Vashishtha hither speedily, that I may slay him.' The lotus-eyed goddess, joining her hands trembled in great fear, like a creeping plant agitated by the wind"..... Vishvamitra, however, although he saw her condition, repeated his command. "The Sarasvati, who knew how sinful was his design, and that the might of Vashishtha was unequalled, went trembling, and in great dread of being cursed by both the sages, to Vashishtha, and told him what his rival had said. Vashishtha seeing her emaciated, pale, and anxious, spoke thus: 'Deliver thyself, O chief of rivers; carry me unhesitatingly to Vishvamitra, lest he curse thee'. Hearing these words of the merciful sage, the Sarasvati considered how she could act most wisely. She reflected, 'Vashishtha has always shown me great kindness; I must seek his welfare.' Then observing the Kausika sage praying and sacrificing on her brink, she regarded that as a good opportunity, and swept away the bank by the force of her current. In this way the son of Mitra and Varuna (Vashishtha) was carried down; and while he was being borne along, he thus celebrated the river: 'Thou, O Sarasvati, issuest from the lake of Brahma, and pervadest the whole world with thy excellent streams. Residing in the sky, thou dischargest water into the colouds. Thou alone art all waters. By these we study.' 'Thou art nourishment, radiance, fame, perfection, intellect, light. Thou art speech; thou art Svaha; this world is subject to thee. Thou, in fourfold form, dwellest in all creatures'.....

Beholding Vashishtha brought near by the Sarasvati, Vishvamitra searched for a weapon with which to make an end of him. Perceiving his anger, and dreading lest Brahmanicide should ensue, the river promptly carried away Vashishtha in an easterly direction; thus fulfilling the commands of both sages, but eluding Vishvamitra. Seeing Vashishtha so carried away, Vishvamitra, impatient, and enraged by vexation, said to her: 'Since thou, O chief of rivers, hast eluded me, and hast receded, roll in waves of blood acceptable to the chief of demons," (which are fabled to gloat on blood). "The Sarasvati, being thus cursed, flowed for a year in a stream mingled with blood..... Rakshasas came to the place of pilgrimage, where Vashishtha had been swept away, and revealed in drinking to satiety

the bloody stream in security, dancing and laughing, as if they had conquered heaven." Some rishis who arrived at the spot some time after were horrified to see the blood-stained water, and the Rakshasas quaffing it, and "made the most strenuous efforts to rescue the Sarasvati."

The foregoing cases relate to individual conflicts between a particular Brahmin and a particular Kshatriya. The cases which follow are cases of class or communal conflicts between Brahmins on the one hand and the Kshatriyas on the other. They are not mere conflicts. Nor is it correct to say that they were like communal riots. They were class wars undertaken by one community with the avowed intention of exterminating the other root and branch. Two such class wars of extermination have been recorded in the Mahabharat. The first is a war of the Haihaya Kshatriyas on the Bhargava Brahmins. It occurred in the reign of the Haihaya King Kritavirya. The following is the description of this war in the Adiparvan of the Mahabharat.

"<sup>1</sup>There was a king named Kritavirya, by whose liberality the Bhrigu, learned in the Vedas, who officiated as his priest, had been greatly enriched with corn, and money. After he had gone to heaven, his descendants were in want of money, and came to beg for a supply from the Bhrigus, of whose wealth they were aware. Some of the latter hid their money under ground, others bestowed it on Brahmins, being afraid of the Kshatriyas, while others again gave these last what they wanted. It happened, however, that a Kshatriya, while digging the ground, discovered some money buried in the house of a Bhrigu. The Kshatriyas then assembled and saw this treasure, and, being incensed, slew in consequence all the Bhrigus, whom they regarded with contempt, down to the children in the womb. The widows, however, fled to the Himalaya mountains. One of them concealed her unborn child in her thigh. The Kshatriyas, hearing of its existence from a Brahmani informant, sought to kill it; but it issued forth from its mother's thigh with lustre, and blinded the persecutors. After wandering about bewildered among the mountains for a time, they humbly supplicated the mother of the child for the restoration of their sight; but she referred them to her wonderful infant Aurva into whom the whole Veda, with its six Vedangas, had entered, as the person who (in retaliation of the slaughter of his relatives) had robbed them of their eye-sight, and who alone could restore it. They accordingly had recourse to him, and their eye-sight was restored. Aurva, however, meditated the destruction of all living creatures, in revenge for the slaughter of the

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 448-449.

Bhrigus, and entered on a course of austerities which alarmed both gods, asuras, and men; but his progenitors (Pitris) themselves appeared, and sought to turn him from his purpose by saying that they had no desire to be revenged on the Kshatriyas: It was not from weakness that the devout Bhrigus overlooked the massacre perpetrated by the murderous Kshatriyas. When we became distressed by old age, we ourselves desired to be slaughtered by them. The money which was buried by someone in a Bhrigu's house was placed there for the purpose of exciting hatred, by those who wished to provoke the Kshatriyas. For what had we, who were desiring heaven, to do with money?" They add that they hit upon this device because they did not wish to be guilty of suicide, and concluded by calling upon Aurva to restrain his wrath; and abstain from the sin he was meditating, "Destroy not the Kshatriyas, O son, nor the seven worlds. Suppress thy kindled anger which nullifies the power of austere-fervour." Aurva, however, replies that he cannot allow his threat to remain unexecuted. His anger, unless wreaked upon some other object, will, he says, consume himself. And he argues on grounds of justice, expediency, and duty, against the clemency which his progenitors recommend. He is, however, persuaded by the Pitris to throw the fire of his anger into the sea, where they say it will find exercise in assailing the watery element, and in this way his threat will be fulfilled."

The second class war and which was also a war of extermination was declared by the Bhargava Brahmins on the Haihaya Kshatriyas. In this the leader of Bhargava Brahmins was one Parashuram. The story of the birth of Parashuram is described in the Vishnu Purana in the following terms:

"<sup>1</sup>Gadhi's daughter Satyavati had been given in marriage to an old Brahman called Richika, of the family of Bhrigu. In order that his wife might bear a son with the qualities of a Brahman, Richika had prepared for her a dish of Charu (rice, barley, and pulse, with butter and milk) for her to eat; and a similar mess for her mother, calculated to make her conceive a son with the character of a warrior. Satyavati's mother, however, persuaded her to exchange messes. She was blamed by her husband on her return home for what she had done. I quote the words of the original:

"Sinful woman, what improper deed is this that thou has done? I beheld thy body of a very terrible appearance. Thou hast certainly eaten the Charu prepared for thy mother. This was wrong. For into that Chari I had infused all the endowments of heriosm, vigour, and

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 349-350.

roce, whilst into thine I had introduced all these qualities of quietude, knowledge, and patience which constitute the perfection of a Brahmin. Since thou hast acted in contravention of my design a son shall be born to thee who shall live the dreadful, martial, and murderous life of a Kshatriya and thy mother's offspring shall exhibit the peaceful disposition and conduct of a Brahman." As soon as she had heard this, Satyavati fell down and seized her husband's feet, and said, 'My lord, I have acted from ignorance; show kindness to me, let me not have a son of the sort thou hast described; if thou pleasest, let me have a grandson of that description.' Subsequently she bore Jamadagni, and her mother gave birth to Vishvamitra. Satyavati became the river called Kausiki. Jamadagni wedded Renuka, the daughter of Renu, of the family of Ikshvaku; and on her he begot a son called Parasurama." The following additional details about Parshuram's family history is given in the Venaparvan of the Mahabharata:

"<sup>1</sup> Jamadagni and Satyavati had five sons, the youngest of whom was the reputable Parasurama. By his father's command he kills his mother (who by the indulgence of impure desire, had fallen from her previous sanctity), after the four elder sons had refused this matricidal offer, and had in consequence been deprived of reason by their father's curse. At Parasurama's desire however, his mother is restored by his father to life, and his brothers to reason; and he himself is absolved from all the guilt of murder; and obtains the boon of invincibility and long life from his father."

This second class war took place in the reign of the Haihaya king Arjuna the son of King Kartavirya. To understand it correctly it is necessary to divide it into two parts for there are two stages in it. The trouble began with the Brahmans claiming certain prerogatives and powers exclusively for themselves and King—Arjuna scouting them in most contemptuous terms. As the Anushasanparvan of the Mahabharata puts it.

"<sup>2</sup> Then ascending his chariot glorious as the resplendent sun, he exclaimed in the intoxication of his prowess, 'Who is like me in fortitude, courage, fame, heroism, energy, and vigour?' At the end of this speech a bodiless voice on the sky addressed him: 'Thou knowest not, O fool, that a Brahman is better than a Kshatriya. It is with the help of the Brahman that the Kshatriya rules his subjects. Arjuna answers 'If I am pleased, I can create, or, if displeased, annihilate, living beings; and no Brahman is superior to me in

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 450.

<sup>2</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 454.

act, thought, or word. The first proposition is that the Brahmins are superior; the second that the Kshatriyas are superior; both of these thou hast stated with their ground, but there is a difference between them. The Brahmins are dependent on the Kshatriyas, and not the Kshatriyas on the Brahmins; and the Kshatriyas on the Brahmins; and the Kshatriyas are eaten up by the Brahmins, who wait upon them and only make the Vedas a pretence. Justice the protection of the people, has its seat in the Kshatriyas. From them the Brahmins derive their livelihood; how then can the latter be superior? I always keep in subjection to myself those Brahmins, the chief of all beings, who subsist on alms, and who have a high opinion of themselves. For truth was spoken by that female the Gayatri in the sky. I shall subdue all those unruly Brahmins clad in hides. No one in the three worlds, god or man can hurl me from my royal authority; wherefore I am superior to any Brahmin."

On hearing this Vayu comes and says to Arjuna:

"<sup>1</sup>Abandon this sinful disposition, and to obeisance to the Brahmins. If thou shalt do them wrong, thy kingdom shall be convulsed. They will subdue thee; those powerful men will humble thee, and expel thee from thy country' The king asks him, 'who art thou? Vayu replies, 'I Vayu, the messenger of the gods, and tell thee what is for thy benefit'. Arjuna rejoins, 'Oh thou displayest to-day a great warmth of devotion to the Brahmins. But say that a Brahmin is like (any other) earth-born creature. Or say that this most excellent Brahmin is something like the wind. But fire is like the waters, or the sun, or the sky.'

Vayu then adduces various instances in which the superiority of the Brahmins has been manifested. Arjuna then drops his hostility against the Brahmins and becomes their friend. In the Anushasanaparva he is reported to have said:

"<sup>2</sup>I live altogether and always for the sake of the Brahmins. I am devoted to the Brahmins, and do obeisance to them continually. And it is through the favour of Dattatreya (A Brahmin) that I have obtained all this power and high renown, and that I have practised righteousness."

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I. pp. 454.

<sup>2</sup> Muir Vol. I. pp. 473

It is in the second stage that Parashuram comes on the scene and exterminates the Kshatriyas. The story is told in the Shantiparvan in the following terms :

“<sup>1</sup>Being of a meek, pious, kind and charitable turn of mind, the valiant Arjuna thought nothing of the curse; but his sons, who were of an arrogant and barbarous disposition, became the cause of its resulting in his death. Without their father's knowledge they took away Jamadagni's calf; and in consequence Parasurama attacked Arjuna and cut off his arms.” His son retaliated by killing Jamadagni. Parashurama incensed at the slaughter of his father, having vowed in consequence to sweep away all Kshatriyas from the earth, seized his weapons; and slaying all the sons and grandsons of Arjuna, with thousands of the Haihayas, he turned the earth into a mass of ensanguined mud. Having thus cleared the earth of Kshatriyas, he became penetrated by deep compassion and retired to the forest. After some thousands of years had elapsed, the hero, naturally irascible, was taunted by Paravsu, the son of Raibhya and grandson of Visvamitra, in a public assembly in these words: ‘Are not these virtuous men, Pratardana and the others, who are assembled at the sacrifice in the city of Yayati,—are they not Kshatriyas? Thou hast failed to execute thy threat, and vainly boastest in the assembly. Thou has withdrawn to the mountain from fear of those valiant Kshatriyas, while the earth has again become overrun by hundred of their race.’ Hearing these words, Rama seized his weapons. The hundreds of Kshatriyas who had before been spared had now grown powerful kings. These, however, Parasurama now slew with their children, and all the numerous infants then unborn as they came into the world. Some, however, were preserved by their mothers.”

Those who are curious to know the subsequent history of the Kshatriyas might be interested in the following extract from the Adiparvan.

“<sup>2</sup>Having one and twenty time swept away all the Kshatriyas from the earth, the son of Jamadagni engaged in austerities on Mahendra the most excellent of mountains. After he had cleared the world of Kshatriyas, their widows came to the Brahmans, praying for offspring. The religious Brahmans, free from any impulse of lust cohabited at the proper seasons with these women, who in consequence became pregnant, and brought forth valiant Kshatriya boys and girls, to continue the Kshatriya stock. Thus was the Kshatriya race virtuously begotten by Brahmans on Kshatriya

<sup>1</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 454-455.

<sup>2</sup> Muir Vol. I, pp. 451-452.



women, and became multiplied and long-lived, thence arose four castes inferior to the Brahmins."

These instances of enmity were accompanied by challenges from one side to the other which shows how high were the tempers running on both sides. The conduct of king Nimi in yoking the Brahmins to his chariot and making them drag it like horses show how determined the Kshatriyas were to humiliate the Brahmins. The challenges uttered by Arjuna Kartavirya against the Brahmins indicates his determination to level them down. The Brahmins on their side were not slow to take up this challenge and send counter challenges to the kshatriyas not to provoke the Brahmins. This is very clear from the way Vayu the messenger or Ambassador of the Brahmins talks to Arjuna Kartavirya after he had issued his challenge to the Brahmins. Vayu tells Arjuna how the Brahmins Atri made sea water saltish by urinating in it, how Dandakas were overthrown by the Brahmins, how the Kshatriyas of the Talajaughas were destroyed by a single Brahmin Aurva; The striking power of the Brahmins is not only superior to that of the Kshatriya it is superior to that of the Devas and Vayu proceeds to tell Arjuna some of the victories achieved by the Brahmins over the Devas. He tells him how Varuna ran away with Bhadra the daughter of Soma and the wife of the Brahman Utathya of the race of Angiras how Utathya by his curse caused the earth to be dried up and how Varuna as a consequence submitted to Utathya and returned his wife. He tells him how once the *Devas* were conquered by the Asuras and the Danavas, how deprived of all oblations, and stripped of their dignity they came to the earth went to the Brahmin Agastya and applied to him for protection and how Agastya scorched the Danavas from heaven and earth and made him fly to the South and reinstated the Devas in their dominion. He tells Arjuna how once the Adityas were performing a sacrifice and while engaged in it were attacked by Danavas called Khalims, who came in ten in thousands to slay them, how the Adityas went to Indra and how Indra himself attacked by the Daityas not being able to render help to the Adityas went to the Brahmin Vashishtha for help and how Vashishtha taking mercy on the Adityas saved them by burning the Danavas alive. He next tells Arjuna how the Danavas once fought with the Devas, how by enveloping them in dreadful darkness the Danavas slaughtered the Devas, how the Devas implored the Brahmin Atri to become the moon and dispell the glow around the sun which Atri did thereby saved the Devas from the Danavas. The last episode of Brahmin prowess which Vayu tells Arjuna is how the Brahmin Chyavana compelled Indra to admit the Ashwins to equal rank and drink Soma with them as a token of equality and

how when Indra refused he took away both the earth and heaven from them and how he created a Demon Mada and put the Devas including Indra into his mouth and how he compelled Indra to admit the Ashwins to equal rank and drink Soma with them and how Indra ultimately surrendered to Chyavana.

Vayu did not merely recount these exploits of the Brahmins. He did something more. Every time he gave Arjuna an instance of the power of the Brahmins he ended by asking Arjuna pointed questions such as "Can you tell me of any Kshatriya who was superior to him (i.e. the Brahmins hero of the story)". "Declare on your part, any Kshatriya who has been superior to him, "Tell me of any Kshatriya superior to Atri."

This class war between the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas must have gone on for ages. In the light of this the attitude of Manu towards this Class War comes as very strange. Consider the following verses from the Manu Smriti :

IV. 135. "Let him who desires prosperity, indeed, never despise a Kshatriya, a snake, and a learned Brahmana, be they ever so feeble."

IV. 136. "Because these three, when treated with disrespect, may utterly destroy him; hence a wise man must never despise them."

X. 322. "Kshatriyas prosper not without Brahmins, Brahmins prosper not without Kshatriyas; Brahmins and Kshatriyas, being closely united, prosper in this (world) and in the next."

Here there is a clear attempt on the part of Manu to close the ranks. Against whom did Manu want the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas to close their ranks? Was this an attempt to forget and forgive or was the motive to combine them in a conspiracy to achieve some unholy purpose. What were the circumstances that forced Manu to advise the Brahmins to forget their age old enmity with Kshatriyas and seek the helping hand? The circumstances, must have been very hard and very pressing. For there was no room left for a reapproachment between the two. The Brahmins had hurled a terrible insult against the Kshatriyas and had wounded their pride by saying quite openly that the Kshatriyas were the illegitimate children of Brahmins begotten by them on Kshatriya widows. The next offensive thing that the Brahmins had done to wound the feelings of the Kshatriyas was to extract from the latter a confession that the Brahmins were superior to the Kshatriyas in military prowess and had made Bhishma say:

"The prowess of the Brahmins can destroy even the gods. Those wise beings behold all these worlds. To them it is indifferent whether they are perfumed with sandal wood or deformed with mire,

whether they eat or fast, whether they are clad in silk, or in sack cloth or skins. They can turn what is not divine into what is divine, and the converse; and can in their anger create other worlds with their guardians. They are the gods of the gods; and the cause of the cause. The ignorant Brahman is a god, whilst a learned Brahman is yet more a god, like the full ocean."

All this makes this sudden climb down by the Brahmins, this stoping down to win over the Kshatriyas very mysterious. What can be the key to this mystery?

□ □

## CHAPTER 16

### Shudras and the Counter-Revolution

*This is a 21-page foolscap typed manuscript. The cover page is having a title 'Shudras and the Counter-Revolution' and the text on next page starts with the same title. All these pages were loose and tagged together. Unfortunately, only 21 pages are available and the latter pages seem to be lost.— Editors.*

The laws of Manu relating to the Status of the Shudra make a very interesting reading for the simple reason that they have moulded the psychology of the Hindus and determined their attitude towards the Shudras who forms at the present and at all times the most numerous part of Hindu society. They are set out below under separate heads so that it may be possible for the reader to have a complete idea of the status given by Manu to the Community of Shudras.

Manu asks the householders of the Brahmana, Kshatriya and Vaishya Class :

IV. 61. Let him not dwell in a country where the rulers are Shudra.

A Shudra is not to be deemed as a respectable person. For Manu enacts that :

XI. 24. A Brahmin shall never beg from a Shudra property for (performing) a sacrifice i.e. for religious purpose. All marriage ties with the Shudra were proscribed. Marriage with a woman belonging to any of the three other classes was forbidden. A Shudra was not to have any connection with a woman of the higher classes and an act of adultery committed by a Shudra with her was declared by Manu to be an offence involving capital punishment.

VIII. 374. A Shudra who has an intercourse with a woman of the higher caste guarded<sup>1</sup> or unguarded, shall be punished in the following manner :

If she was unguarded, he loses the offending part. If she was guarded then he should be put to death and his property confiscated.

As to office Manu prescribes.

<sup>1</sup> Guarded means under the protection of some relation. Unguarded means living alone.

VIII. 20. A Brahmana who is only a Brahmana by decent i.e. one who has neither studied nor performed any other act required by the Vedas may, at the king's pleasure, interpret the law to him i.e. act as the Judge, but never a Shudra (however learned he may be).

VIII. 21. The kingdom of that monarch who looks on while a Shudra settles the law will sink low like a cow in a morass.

VIII. 272. If a Shudra arrogantly presumes to preach religion to Brahmins the King shall have poured burning oil in his mouth and ears.

In the matter of acquiring learning the knowledge Manu ordains as follows:

III. 156. He who instructs Shudra pupils and he whose teacher is a Shudra shall become disqualified for being invited to a Shudra.

IV. 99. He must never read the Vedas . . . . in the presence of the Shudras.

Manu's successors went much beyond him in the cruelty of their punishment of the Shudra for studying the Veda. For instance Katyayana lays down that if a Shudra overheard the Veda or ventured to utter a word of the Veda the King shall cut his tongue in twain and pour hot molten lead in his ears.

As to right to property by the Shudra Manu enjoins as follows:

X. 129. No superfluous collection of wealth must be made by a Shudra, even though he has power to make it, since a servile man, who has amassed riches, becomes proud, and, by his insolence or neglect, gives pain to Brahmans.

VIII. 417. A Brahmanas may seize without hesitation if he be in distress for his subsistence, the goods of his Shudra.

The Shudra can have only one occupation. This is one of the inexorable Laws of Manu. Says Manu:

I. 91. One occupation only, the Lord prescribed to the Shudra, to serve meekly these other three castes (namely Brahmin, Kshatriya and Vaishyas).

X. 121. If a Shudra, (unable to subsist by serving Brahmans) seeks a livelihood, he may serve Kshatriyas, or he may also seek to maintain himself by attending on a wealthy Vaisya.

X. 122. But let (Shudra) serve Brahmans, either for the sake of heaven, or with a view to both (this life and the next); for he who is called the servant of a Brahmana thereby gains all his ends.

X. 123. The service of Brahmanas alone is declared (to be) an excellent occupation for a Shudra for whatever else besides this he may perform will bear him no fruit.

Service by Shudra is not left by Manu to be regulated as a free contract. If the Shudra refuses to serve there is a provision for conscription which runs as follows:

VIII. 413. A Brahmana may compel a Shudra, whether bought or unbought to do servile work; for he is created by the creator to be the slave of a Brahmana.

X. 124. They must allot to him out of their own family (property) a suitable maintenance, after considering his ability, his industry, and the number of those whom he is bound to support.

X. 125. The remnants of their food must be given to him, as well as their old household furniture.

A Shudra is required by Manu to be servile in his speech and manner towards the other classes.

VIII. 270. A Shudra who insults a twice-born man with gross invective, shall have his tongue cut out; for he is of low origin.

VIII. 271. If he mentions the names and castes of the (twice-born) with contumely, an iron nail, ten fingers long, shall be thrust red hot into his mouth.

Manu is not satisfied with this. He wants this servile status of the Shudra to be expressed in the names and surnames of persons belonging to that community. Manu says:

II. 31. Let the first part of a Brahman's name denote something auspicious, a Kshatriya's be connected with power and a Vaishya's with wealth, but a Shudra's, express something contemptible.

II. 32. The second part of a Brahman's name shall be a word implying happiness; of a Kshatriya's word implying protection; of a Vaishya's a term expressive of thriving and of a Shudra's an expression denoting services.

What was the position of the Shudra before Manu? Manu treats the Shudra as though he was an alien Non-Aryan not entitled to the social and religious privileges of the Aryan. Unfortunately the view that the Shudra was a Non-Aryan is too readily accepted by the generality of the people. But there can be no doubt that this view has not the slightest foundation in the literature of the ancient Aryans.

Reading the Religious literature of the ancient Aryans one comes across the names of various communities and groups of people. There were first of all the Aryans with their fourfold divisions of Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. Besides them and apart from them there were (i) Asuras (ii) Suras or Devas (iii) Yakshas (iv) Gandharvas (v) Kinnars (vi) Charanas (vii) Ashvins and (viii) Nishadas. The Nishadas were a jungle people primitive and uncivilized. The Gandharvas, Yakshas, Kinnars, Charanas and Ashvins were professional classes and

not communities. The word Asura is generic name given to various tribes known by their tribal names of Daityas, Danavas, Dasyus, Kalananjas, Kaleyyas, Kalins, Nagas, Nivata-Kavachas, Paulomas, Pishachas and Raxasas. We do not know if the Suras and Devas were composed of various tribes as the Asuras were. We only know the leaders of the Deva Community. The well known amongst them were Brahma, Vishnu Rudra, Surya, Indra, Varuna, Soma etc.

Due mostly to the ignorant interpretations of Sayanacharya some very curious beliefs prevail even among the best informed people about these communities namely the Aryans, the Asuras and the Devas and their inter-relation and their consanguinity. It is believed that the Asuras were not a human species at all. They are held to have been ghosts and goblins who plagued the Aryans with their nocturnal visitations. The Suras or Devas are understood to be poetic deifications of nature's forces. With regard to the Aryans the belief is that they were a fair race with sharp nose and had a great deal of colour prejudice. As to the Dasyus it is asserted that a Dasyu is only another name for a Shudra. The Shudras it is said formed the aboriginals of India. They were dark and flat nosed. The Aryans who invaded India conquered them and made them slaves and as a badge of slavery gave them the name Dasyu which it is said comes from the word Das<sup>1</sup> which means a slave.

Every one of these beliefs is unfounded. The Asuras and Suras were communities of human beings as the Aryans were. The Asuras and Suras were descended from a common father Kashapa. The story is that Daksha Prajapati had 60 daughters, of them thirteen were given in marriage to Kashapa. Diti and Aditi were two among the 13 of Kashapa's wives. Those born to Diti were called Asuras and those born to Aditi were called Suras or Devas. The two fought a long and a bloody battle for the sovereignty of the world. This no doubt is mythology and mythology though it is history in hyperbole is still history.

The Aryans were not a race. The Aryans were a collection of people. The cement that held them together was their interest in the maintenance of a type of culture called Aryan culture. Any one who accepted the Aryan culture was an Aryan. Not being a race there was no fixed type of colour and physiognomy which could be called Aryan. There was no dark and flat nose people for the Aryans to distinguish themselves from<sup>2</sup>. The whole of this edifice of colour prejudice as being factors for division and antagonism between Aryans and the Dasyus is based upon a wrong meaning given to the two words *Varna* and *Anas* which are used with reference to the Dasyus. The word *Varna* is taken to mean colour and the

<sup>1</sup> According to Nirukta, Das means to destroy.

<sup>2</sup> On the whole of this subject see a brilliant discussion by Mr. Satvalekar in Purusharth Vol. XIII. p.

word *Anas* is taken to mean without nose. Both these meanings are erroneous. Varna means Caste or group and *Anas* if read as An-As means uncultivated speech. That statement that the Aryans had a colour prejudice which determined their social order is arrant nonsense. If there were any people who were devoid of colour prejudice it is the Aryans and that is because there was no dominant colour to distinguish themselves.

It is wrong to say that the Dasyus were non-Aryans by race. The Dasyus were not a pre-Aryan race of aboriginals of India. The Dasyus were members of the Aryan community who were deprived of the title of Arya for opposing some belief or cult which was an essential part of the Aryan Culture. How this belief that the Dasyus were Non-Aryans by race could have arisen it is difficult to understand. In the Rig Veda (X. 49) Indra says: "I (Indra) have killed with my thunderbolt for the good of the man, known as Kavi. I have protected Kupa by adopting means of protection. I took up the thunderbolt for killing Susna. *I have deprived the Dasyus of the appellation of Arya.*"

Nothing can be more positive and definite than this statement of Indra that the Dasyus were Aryans. Further and better proof of this fact can be had in the impeachment of Indra for the various atrocities he had committed. In the list of atrocities for which Indra was impeached there was one charge namely the killing of Vratra. Vratra was the leader of the Dasyus. It is unthinkable that such a charge could be framed against Indra if the Dasyus were not Aryans.

It is erroneous to believe that the Shudras were conquered by the Aryan invaders. In the first place the story that the Aryans came from outside India and invaded the natives has no evidence to support it. There is a large body of evidence that India is the home of the Aryans. In the second place there is no evidence anywhere of any warfare having taken place between Aryans and Dasyus but the Dasyus have nothing to do with the Shudras. In the third place it is difficult to believe that the Aryans were a powerful people capable of much military prowess. Any one who reads the history of the Aryans in India in their relation to the Devas will be reminded of the relationship that subsisted between the Viellens and their lords during the feudal times. The Devas were the feudal lords and the Aryans were the Villens. The innumerable sacrifices which the Aryans performed have the look of fudal dues paid to the Deva. This servility of the Aryans to the Devas was due to the fact that without the help and the protection of the Devas they could not withstand the assaults of the Asuras. It is too much to presume that so effete a people could have conquered the Shudras. Lastly there was no necessity to conquer the Shudra. They were Aryans in the only sense in which the word Aryan is used,



namely, the upholders of the Aryans Culture. Two things are clear about the Shudras. Nobody has ever contended that they were dark and flat nosed. Nobody has contended that they were defeated or enslaved by the Aryans. It is wrong to treat the Dasyus and Shudras as one and the same. As a people they may be the same. But culturally they were quite different. The Dasyus were Non-Aryans in the sense they had fallen away and rebelled against the Aryan culture. The Shudras on the other hand were Aryans i.e. they were believers in the Aryan way of life. The Shudra was accepted as an Aryan and as late as Kautilya's Artha Shastra was addressed an Arya.

The Shudra was an integral, natural and valued member of the Aryan Society is proved by a prayer which is found in the Yajur Veda<sup>1</sup> and which is offered by the Sacrificer. It runs as follows:

"..... O Gods

Give lustre to our holy priests, set lustre in our ruling chiefs,  
Lustre to Vaisyas, Sudras: Give, through lustre; Lustre unto me."

It is a remarkable prayer, remarkable because it shows that the Shudra was a member of the Aryan Community and was also a respected member of it.

That the Shudras were invited to be present at the coronation of the King along with Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas is proved by the description given in the Mahabharata of the coronation of Yudhishthira the eldest brother of the Pandavas. Shudra took part in the consecration of the King. According to ancient writer called Nilkantha speaking of the coronation ceremony expressly says: "that the four chief Ministers, Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra consecrated the new king. Then the leaders of each Varna and by the Castes lower still consecrated him with the holy water. Then followed acclamation by the twice-born. In the post-vedic period preceding Manu there was group of the representatives of the people called the Ratnis. The Ratnis played a significant part in the investiture of the King. The Ratnis were so called because they held the Ratna (jewel) which was a symbol of sovereignty. The king received his sovereignty only when the Ratnis handed over to him the jewel of sovereignty and on receiving his sovereignty the King went to the house of each of the Ratnis and made an offering to him. It is a significant fact that the Shudra was one of the Ratnis.

Shudras were members of the two political Assemblies of ancient times namely the Janapada and Paura and as a member of this he was entitled to special respect even from a Brahmin.

<sup>1</sup>..... White Yajur Veda p. 200.

That the Shudra in the Ancient Aryan Society had reached a high political status is indisputable. They could become ministers of State. The Mahabharat bears testimony to this. Enumerating the different classes of ministers within his memory the writer of the Mahabharata mentions a list<sup>1</sup> of 37 Ministers of whom four are Brahmins, eight Kshatriyas, twenty one Vaishyas, three Shudras and one Suta.

Shudras did not stop with being ministers of State. They even became Kings. The story of Shudras which is given in the Rig Veda stands in cruel contrast with the views expressed by Manu regarding the eligibility of the Shudra to be a King. The reign of Sudas if referred to at all is referred only in connection with the terrible contest between Vashishtha and Vishvamitra as to who should become the purohit or Royal priest of King Sudas. The issue involved in the contest was as to the right to officiate as the Purohit or the King. Vashishtha who was a Brahmin and who was already an officiating priest of Sudas claimed that a Brahmin alone could become the Purohit of a King while Vishvamitra who was a Kshatriya contended that a Kshatriya was competent for that office. Vishvamitra succeeded and in his turn became the Purohit of Sudas. The contest is indeed memorable because the issue involved in it is very crucial although the result has not been a permanent deprivation of the Brahmins. But there can be no doubt the story is probably the best piece of social history that is to be found in the ancient literature. Unfortunately nobody has taken serious notice of it. Nobody has even asked who this King was. Sudas was the son of Paijavana and Paijavana is the son of Devodas who was the King of Kasi i.e. Benares. What was the Varna of Sudas? Few would believe if they were told that King Sudas was a Shudra. But that is a fact and it can be proved by the testimony of the Mahabharata<sup>2</sup> where in the Santipurva a reference is made to this *Paijavana*. It is stated that Paijavana was a Shudra. In the light of this the story of Sudas sheds new light on the status of the Shudra in the Aryan Society. It shows that a Shudra could be a reigning monarch. It also shows that both the Brahmins and the Kshatriyas not only saw no humiliation in serving a Shudra King but they with each other to secure his patronage and were ready to perform vedic ceremonies at his house.

It cannot be said that there were no Shudra Kings in later times. On the contrary history shows that the two dynasties which preceded Manu were dynasties of Shudras Kings. The Nandas who ruled from B.C.413 to B.C. 322\* were Shudras. The mauryas who succeeded

<sup>1</sup> Jaiswal—Hindu Polity Part II. p. 148.

<sup>2</sup> Muir Sanskrit Texts Vol. I. p. 366.

\* Figures are incorporated by Editors as they are not in the M.S.—Editors.

the Nandas and who ruled from 322 B.C. to 183 B.C.\* were also Shudras. What more glaring piece of evidence can there be to show the high dignity enjoyed by the Shudra than to point to the case of Asoka who was not merely the Emperor of India but a Shudra and his Empire was the Empire built by the Shudras.

On the question of the right of the Shudra to study the Vedas a reference may be made to the Chhandogya Upanished (V. 1.2). It relates the story of one Janasruti to whom Veda Vidya was taught by the preceptor Raikva. This Janasruti was a Shudra. This story if it is a genuine story leaves no doubt that there was a time when there was no bar against the Shudra in the matter of studying the Vedas.

Not only was Shudra free to study the Vedas but there were Shudras who had reached the status of Rishis and has been composers of the Hymns of the Vedas. The story of the Rishi Kavasha Aliusha<sup>1</sup> is very illuminating. He was a Rishi and the author of several hymns of the Tenth Book of the Rig-Veda.<sup>2</sup>

On the question of the spiritual eligibility of the Shudra to perform the Vedic ceremonies and sacrifices the following data may be presented. Jaimini<sup>3</sup> the author of the Purva Mimansa mentions an ancient teacher by name Badari—whose work is lost as an exponent of the view that even Shudra could perform Vedic sacrifices. The Bharadvaja Srauta Sutra (v. 28) admits that there exists another school of thought which holds that a Sudra can consecrate the three sacred fires necessary for the performance of a Vedic Sacrifice. Similarly the Commentator of the Katyayana Srauta Sutra (1 & 5) admits that there are certain Vedic texts which lead to the inference that the Shudra was eligible to perform Vedic rites. In the Satpath Brahmana (I. 1.4.12) there is enunciated a rule of etiquette which the priest officiating at the performance of a sacrifice is required to observe. It relates to the mode in which the priest should address the Haviskut (the person celebrating the sacrifice) calling upon him to begin the ceremony. The rule says:

“Now there are four different forms of this call, viz. ‘Come hither’ (Ehi) in the case of a Brahmana; ‘approach’ (Agahi) and ‘hasten hither’ (Adarva) in the case of a Vaishya and a member of the Military caste and ‘run hither’ (Adhava) in that of a Shudra.”

In the Satpatha Brahman<sup>4</sup> there is evidence to show that the Shudra was eligible to perform the Soma Yaga and to partake of the divine drink Soma. It says that in the Soma Yaga in place of a ‘payovrata’

<sup>1</sup> Aitereya Brahmana Vol. II. p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> Max-Muller—Ancient Sanskrit Literature 1860 p.58.

<sup>3</sup> See Kane—History of Dharmashastras.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Kane—History of Dharmashastra.

\* Figures are incorporated by Editors as they are not in the MS.—Editors.

(vow to drink milk only) Mastu (whey) is prescribed for the Shudra. In another place the same Satapatha Brahmana<sup>1</sup> says:

“There are four classes, the Brahmin, Rajanya, Vaishya and Sudra. There is no one of these who dislikes Soma. If any one of them however should do so, let there be an atonement.”

This means that the drinking of Soma was not only permissible but it was compulsory on all including the Shudra. But in the story of the Ashvins there is definite evidence that the Shudra had a right to the divine drink of Soma. The Ashvins as the story<sup>2</sup> goes once happened to behold Sukanya when she had just bathed and when her person was bare. She was young girl married to a Rishi by name Chyavana who at the time of marriage was so old as to be dying almost any day. The Ashvins were captivated by the beauty of Sukanya and said “accept one of us for your husband. it behoveth thee not to spend thy youth fruitlessly.”

She refused saying “I am devoted to my husband.” They again spoke to her and this time proposed a bargain—“We two are the celestial physicians of note. We will make thy husband young and graceful. Do thou then select one of us as thy husband.” She went to her husband and communicated to him the terms of the bargain. Chyavana said to Sukanya “Do thou so” and the bargain was carried out and Chyavana was made a young man by the Ashvins. Subsequently a question arose whether the Ashvins were entitled to Soma which was the drink of the Gods. Indra objected saying that the Ashvins were Shudras and therefore not entitled to Soma. Chyavana who had received perpetual youth from the Ashvins set aside the contention and compelled Indra to give them Soma.

All these provisions can have no meaning unless the Shudra was in fact performing the Vedic ceremonies to which they relate—there is evidence to show that a Shudra woman took part in the Vedic sacrifice known as the Ashwamedha.<sup>3</sup>

With regard to the Upanayana ceremony and the right to wear the sacred thread there is nowhere an express prohibition against the Shudra. On the other hand in the Sansakara Ganapati there is an express provision declaring the Shudra to be eligible for Upanayan.<sup>4</sup>

The Shudra though belonging to a lower class was nonetheless a free citizen in days before Manu cannot be gainsaid. Consider the following provisions in Kautilya's Artha Shastra:

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Muir- Sanskrit Texts I. p. 367.

<sup>2</sup> V. Fausboil Indian Mythology pp. 128-134.

<sup>3</sup> Jaiswal- Indian Polity Part II. p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Referred to by Max-Muller in Ancient Sanskrit Literature-- (1860)-- p. 207.

“The selling or mortgaging by kinsmen of the life of a Sudra who is not a born slave, and has not attained majority, but is an Arya in birth shall be punished with a fine of 2 panas.”

“Deceiving a slave of his money or depriving him of the privileges he can exercise as an Arya (Aryabhava), shall be punished with half the fine (levied for enslaving the life of an Arya).”

“Failure to set a slave at liberty on the receipt of a required amount of ransom shall be punished with a fine of 12 panas; putting a slave under confinement for no reason (samrodhaschakaranat) shall likewise be punished.

“The offspring of a man who has sold himself off as a slave shall be an Arya. A slave shall be entitled without prejudice to his master’s work but also the inheritance he has received from his father.”

Why did Manu suppress the Shudra?

This riddle of the Shudra is not a simple riddle. It is a complex one. The Aryans were for ever attempting to Aryanize the Non-Aryans i.e. bringing them within the pale of the Aryan Culture. So keen were the Aryans on Aryanization that they had developed a religious ceremony for the mass conversion of the Non-Aryans. The ceremony was called Vratya-stoma. Speaking of the Vratya-Stoma Mahamahopadhyaya Haraprasad Shastri says:

“The ceremony by which these Vratyas were purified, and which is described in the Pancavimsa Brahmana differed at least in one particular from other great ceremonies of the Vedic times, namely, while other ceremonies had only one sacrificer and his wife in the hall of sacrifice, this ceremony had thousands of sacrificers. One of them, the wisest, the richest or the most powerful acted as Grahapati or Patriarch and the rest simply followed him. The Grahapati had to pay a higher Daksina or fee than the rest.”

“I consider this to be a device by which thousands and thousands of Vratyas were admitted to the society of the Rsis by one ceremony, and such ceremonies were of frequent occurrence, thus admitting hordes after hordes of nomadic Aryans into settled habits. The purified Vratyas were not allowed to bring their possessions in Vratya life with them in settled life. They had to leave them to those who remained Vratyas still or do the so-called Brahmins of the Magadha-desa, which, as I have elsewhere shown, was mostly inhabited by men whom the Rsis looked down upon.”

“But when the Vratyas were admitted to settled life, they were admitted as fully equals. The Rsis used to eat food cooked by them, and they used to eat food cooked by the Rsis. They were taught all

the three Vidyas, Sama, Rk, and Yajus, and they were allowed to study the Vedas, and teach them, and to sacrifice for themselves and for others, that is, they were considered as fully equal. Not only were they treated as fully equal but they attained the highest proficiency of a Rsi. Samans were revealed to them, and even Rks. One of the purified Vratyas, Kausitaki was allowed to collect Brahmans of the Rig-Veda, which collection still goes under his name."

The Aryans were not only converting to their way of life the willing non-Aryans they were also attempting to make converts from among the unwilling Asuras who were opposed to the Aryans, their cult of sacrifice, their theory of Chaturvarna and even to their Vedas which according to the mythology the Asuras stole away from the Aryas. The story of Vishnu rescuing Pralhad by killing his father the Asura called Hiranya Kashapu on the ground that Pralhad was willing to be converted to the Aryan Culture while Hiranya Kashapu was opposed to it is an illustration in point. Here are instances of Non-Aryans being naturalized and enfranchized. Why was an opposite attitude taken against the Shudra? Why was the Shudra fully naturalized and fully enfranchized, denaturalized and disfranchized?

The treatment given to the *Nishadas* gives a point to this riddle which should not be overlooked. The Ancient Sanskrit Literature is full of reference to the five tribes. They are described under various appellations<sup>1</sup> such as Panch-Krishtayah, Panch-Kshitayah, Panch-Kshityas Manushyah, Panch-Charshanayah, Panch-Janah, Panchijanya viz., Pancha-Bhuma, Panchajata. There is a difference of opinion as to what these terms denote. Sayanacharya the Commentator of Rig Veda says that these expressions refer to the four Varnas and the Nishads. The Vishnu Purana gives the following story about the Nishads:

"7. The Maiden named Sunitha, who was the first born of Mrityu (Death) was given as wife to Anga; and of her Vena was born."

8. This son of Mrityu's daughter, infected with the taint of his maternal grandfather, was born corrupt, as if by nature.

9. When Vena was inaugurated as king by the eminent rishis, he caused this proclamation to be made on the earth; "Men must not sacrifice, or give gifts, or present oblations. Who else but myself is the enjoyer of sacrifices? I am for ever the lord of offerings."

10. Then all the rishis approaching the king with respectful salutations, said to him in a gentle and conciliatory tone:

<sup>1</sup> Source not quoted.—Editors.

11. 'Hear, O King, what we have to say:

12. We shall worship Hari, the monarch of the Gods, and the lord of all sacrifices with a Dirghasattra (prolonged sacrifice), from which the highest benefits will accrue to your kingdom, your person and your subjects. May blessing rest upon you? You shall have a share in the ceremony.

13. Vishnu the Lord of sacrifices Male, being propitiated by us with this rite, will grant all the objects of your desire. Hari, the Lord of Sacrifices, bestows on those kings in whose country he is honoured with oblation everything that they wish." Vena replied: "What other being is superior to me? Who else but I should be adored? Who is this person called Hari, whom you regard as the Lord of sacrifice? Brahma Janardana, Rudra, Indra, Vayu, Yama, Ravi (the Sun) Agni, Varuna, Dhatri, Pushan, Earth, the Moon,—these and the other gods who curse and bless are all present in king's person: for he is composed of all the gods. Knowing this, ye must act in conformity with my commands. Brahmans, ye must neither give gifts, nor present oblations nor sacrifices.

14. As obedience to their husbands is esteemed the highest duty of women, so is the observance of my orders incumbent upon you." The Rishis answered. 'Give permission great kings: let not religion perish: this whole world is but a modified form of oblations.

15. When religion perishes the whole world is destroyed with it, When Vena although thus admonished and repeatedly addressed by the eminent rishis, did not give his permission, then all the munis, filled with wrath and indignation, cried out to one another, "Slay, slay the sinner."

16. This man of degraded life, who blasphemes the sacrificed Male, the god, the Lord without beginning or end, is not fit to be lord of the earth.' So saying the munis smote with blades of kusa grass consecrated by texts this king who had been already smitten by his blasphemy of the divine being and his other offences. The munis afterwards beheld dust all round, and asked the people who were standing near what that was.

17. They were informed: "In this country which has no king, the people being distressed, have become robbers, and have begun to seize the property of others.

18. It is from these robbers rushing impetuously, and plundering other men's goods, that this great dust is seen?" Then all the munis, consulting together, rubbed with force the thigh of the king, who was childless, in order to produce a son. From his thigh when

rubbed there was produced a man like a charred log, with flat face, and extremely short.

19. "What shall I do," cried the man, in distress, to the Brahmins. They said to him, "Sit down (nishida); and from this he became a Nishada.

20. From his sprang the Nishadas dwelling in the Vindhya mountains, distinguished by their wicked deeds.

21. By this means the sin of the king departed out of him; and so were the Nishads produced, the offspring of the wickedness of Vena."

This is a mythological origin of the Nishads. But it contains historical facts. It proves that the Nishads were a low, primitive jungle tribe living in the forests of the Vindhya mountains, that they were a wicked people i.e. opposed to the Aryan Culture. They invented a mythology for explaining their origin and connecting them with the Aryan Society. All this was done in order to support the inclusion of the Nishads into the Aryan fold though not in the Aryan Society. Now there is nowhere any sort of disabilities imposed upon Nishads a low, uncivilized and foreign tribe. Question is why were the disabilities imposed upon the Shudra, who was civilized and an Arya?

□ □



## CHAPTER 17

### The Woman and the Counter-Revolution

*There is one copy with a title 'The Woman and the Counter-Revolution'. There is another copy of the same text with a title, 'The Riddle of the Woman'. The Editorial Board felt that this essay would be appropriate in this Volume rather than in the volume of 'Riddles in Hinduism'.—Editors.*

Manu can hardly be said to be more tender to women than he was to the Shudra. He starts with a low opinion of women. Manu proclaims:

II. 213. It is the nature of women to seduce men in this (world); for that reason the wise are never unguarded in (the company of) females.

II. 214. For women are able to lead astray in (this) world not only a fool, but even a learned man, and (to make) him a slave of desire and anger.

II. 215. One should not sit in a lonely place with one's mother, sister or daughter; for the senses are powerful, and master even a learned man.

IX. 14. Women do not care for beauty, nor is their attention fixed on age; (thinking); '(It is enough that) he is a man', they give themselves to the handsome and to the ugly.

IX. 15. Through their passion for men, through their mutable temper, through their natural heartlessness, they become disloyal towards their husbands, however, carefully they may be guarded in this (world).

IX. 16. Knowing their disposition, which the Lord of creatures laid in them at the creation, to be such, (every) man should most strenuously exert himself to guard them.

IX. 17. (When creating them) Manu allotted to women (a love of their) bed, (of their) seat and (of) ornament, impure desires, wrath, dishonesty, malice, and bad conduct.

The laws of Manu against women are of a piece with this view. Women are not to be free under any circumstances. In the opinion of Manu:

IX. 2. Day and night women must be kept in dependence by the males (of their families), and, if they attach themselves to sexual enjoyments, they must be kept under one's control.

IX. 3. Her father protects (her) in childhood, her husband protects (her) in youth, and her sons protect (her) in old age; a woman is never fit for independence.

IX. 5. Women must particularly be guarded against evil inclinations, however trifling (they may appear); for, if they are not guarded, they will bring sorrow on two families.

IX. 6. Considering that the highest duty of all castes, even weak husbands (must) strive to guard their wives.

IV. 147. By a girl, by a young woman, or even by an aged one, nothing must be done independently, even in her own house.

V. 148. In childhood a female must be subject to her father, in youth to her husband, when her lord is dead to her sons; a woman must never be independent.

V. 149. She must not seek to separate herself from her father, husband, or sons; by leaving them she would make both (her own and her husband's) families contemptible.

Woman is not to have a right to divorce.

IX. 45. The husband is declared to be one with the wife, which means that there could be no separation once a woman is married.

Many Hindus stop here as though this is the whole story regarding Manu's law of divorce and keep on idolizing it by comforting their conscience by holding out the view that Manu regarded marriage as sacrament and therefore, did not allow divorce. This of course is far from the truth. His law against divorce had a very different motive. It was not to tie up a man to a woman but it was to tie up the woman to a man and to leave the man free.

For Manu does not prevent a man from giving up his wife. Indeed he not only allows him to abandon his wife but he also permits him to sell her. But what he does is to prevent the wife from becoming free. See what Manu says:

IX. 46. Neither by sale nor by repudiation is a wife released from her husband.

The meaning is that a wife, sold or repudiated by her husband, can never become the legitimate wife of another who may have bought or received her after she was repudiated. If this is not monstrous nothing can be. But Manu was not worried by consideration of justice or injustice of his law. He wanted to deprive woman of the freedom she had under the Buddhistic regime. He knew that by her misuse of her liberty, by her willingness to marry the Shudra the system of the

gradation of the Varna had been destroyed. Manu was outraged by her license and in putting a stop to it he deprived her of her liberty.

A wife was reduced by manu to the level of a slave in the matter of property.

IX. 416. A wife, a son, and a slave, these three are declared to have no property; the wealth which they earn is (acquired) for him to whom they belong.

When she becomes a widow Manu allows her maintenance, if her husband was joint, and a widow's estate in the property of her husband, if he was separate from his family. But Manu never allows her to have any dominion over property.

A woman under the laws of Manu is subject to corporal punishment and Manu allows the husband the right to beat his wife.

VIII. 299. A wife, a son, a slave, a pupil and a younger brother of full blood, who have committed faults, may be beaten with a rope or a split bamboo. In other matters woman was reduced by Manu to the same position as the Shudra.

The study of the Veda was forbidden to her by Manu as it was to the Shudra.

II. 66. Even for a woman the performance of the *Sanskaras* are necessary and they should be performed. But they should be performed without uttering the Veda Mantras.

IX. 18. Women have no right to study the Vedas. That is why their Sanskars are performed without Veda Mantras. Women have no knowledge of religion because they have no right to know the Vedas. The uttering of the Veda Mantras is useful for removing sin. As women cannot utter the Veda Mantras they are as unclean as untruth is.

Offering sacrifices according to Brahmanism formed the very soul of religion. Yet Manu will not allow women to perform them. Manu ordains that:

XI. 36. A woman shall not perform the daily sacrifices prescribed by the Vedas.

XI, 37, If she does it she will go to hell.

To disable her from performing such sacrifices Manu prevents her from getting the aid and services of a Brahmin priest.

IV. 205. A Brahman must never eat food given at a sacrifice performed by a woman.

IV. 206. Sacrifices performed by women are inauspicious and not acceptable to God. They should therefore be avoided.

Woman was not to have any intellectual pursuits nor free will, nor freedom of thought. She was not to join any heretical sect such as

Buddhism. If she continues to adhere to it till death she is not to be given the libation of water as is done in the case of all dead.

Finally a word regarding the ideal of life, Manu has sought to place before a woman. It had better be stated in his own words:

V. 151. Him to whom her father may give her, or her brother with the father's permission, she shall obey as long as he lives and when he is dead, she must not insult his memory.

V. 154. Though destitute or virtue, or seeking pleasure elsewhere, or devoid of good qualities, yet a husband must be constantly worshipped as a god by a faithful wife.

V. 155. No sacrifice, no vow, no fast must be performed by women, apart from their husbands; if a wife obeys her husband, she will for that reason alone be exalted in heaven.

Then comes the choicest texts which forms the pith and the marrow of this ideal which Manu prescribes for women:

V. 153. The husband who wedded her with sacred Mantras, is always a source of happiness to his wife, both in season and out of season, in this world and in the next.

V. 150. She must always be cheerful, clever in the management of her household affairs, careful in cleaning her utensils, and economical in expenditure.

This the Hindus regard as a very lofty ideal for a woman!

Compare with this the position of the woman before the days of Manu.

That a woman was entitled to Upanayan is clear from the Atharva Veda where a girl is spoken of as being eligible for marriage having finished her Brahmacharya. From the Shrauta Sutras it is clear that women could repeat the Mantras of the Vedas and that women were taught to read the Vedas. Panini's Ashtadhyai bears testimony to the fact that women attended Gurukul and studied the various Shakhas of the Veda and became expert in Mimansa. Patanjali's Maha Bhashya shows that women were teachers and taught Vedas to girl students. The stories of women entering into public discussions with men on most abstruse subjects of religion, philosophy and metaphysics are by no means few. The story of public disputation between Janaka and Sulbha, between Yajnavalkya and Gargi, between Yajnavalkya and Maitrei and between Shankaracharya and Vidyadhari shows that Indian women in pre-Manu's time could rise to the highest pinnacle of learning and education.

That women in pre-Manu days were highly respected cannot be disputed. Among the Ratnis who played so prominent a part in the coronation of the King in Ancient India was the queen and the King

made her an offering<sup>1</sup> as he did to the others. Not only the king elect did homage to the Queen, he worshipped his other wives of lower castes<sup>2</sup>. In the same way the King offers salutation after the coronation ceremony to the, ladies of the chiefs of the shremes (guides<sup>3</sup>).

In the days of Kautilya women<sup>4</sup> were deemed to have attained their age of majority at 12 and men at 16. The age of majority was in all probability the age of marriage. That the marriages were post puberty marriages is clear from Baudhayanas' Grihya Sutras<sup>5</sup> where an expiatory ceremony is specially prescribed in the case of a bride passing her menses on the occasion of her marriage.

In Kautilya there is no law as to age of consent. That is because marriages were post puberty marriages and Kautilya is more concerned with cases in which a bride or a bridegroom is married without disclosing the fact of his or her having had sexual intercourse before marriage with another person or maiden in menses having had sexual intercourse. In the former case Kautilya says<sup>6</sup>:

"Any person who has given a girl in marriage without announcing her guilt of having laid with another shall not only be punished with a fine but also be made to return the Sulka and Stridhana. Any person receiving a girl in marriage without announcing the blemishes of the bridegroom shall not only pay double the above fine, but also forfeit the Sulka and Stridhana (he paid for the bride). In regard to the latter case the rule in Kautilya<sup>7</sup> is:

"It is no offence for a man of equal caste and rank to have connection with a maiden who has been unmarried three years after her first menses. Nor is it an offence for a man, even of different caste, to have connection with a maiden who has spent more than three years after her first menses and has no jewellery on her person."

Unlike Manu Kautilya's idea is monogamy. Man can marry more than one wife only under certain conditions. They are given by Kautilya in the following terms<sup>1</sup>:

"If a woman either brings forth no (live) children, or has no male issue, or is barren, her husband shall wait for eight years (before marrying another). If she bears only a dead child, he has to wait for ten years. If she brings forth only females, he has to wait for twelve

<sup>1</sup> Jaiswal; Indian Polity, Part II, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Part II, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> Sham Shastri, Kautilya's Arthashastra, p. 175.

<sup>5</sup> Baudhyayana, I. 7. 22.

<sup>6</sup> Sham Shastri, Kautilya's Arthashastra, p. 222.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 259.

years. Then if he is desirous to have sons, he may marry another. In case of violating this rule, he shall be made to pay her not only Sulks, her property (Stridhana) and an adequate monetary compensation (adhivedanika martham), but also a fine of 24 panas to the Government. Having given the necessary amount of Sulka and property (Stridhana) even to those women who have not received such things on the occasion of their marriage with him, and also having given his wives the proportionate compensation and an adequate subsistence (vrutti), he may marry any number of women; for women are created for the sake of sons."

Unlike Manu in Kautilya's time women could claim divorce on the ground of mutual enmity and hatred.

"A woman, hating her husband, cannot dissolve her marriage with him against his will. Nor can a man dissolve his marriage with his wife against her will. But from mutual enmity, divorce may be obtained (parasparam dveshanmokshah). If a man, apprehending danger from his wife, desires divorce (mokshamichchhet), he shall return to her whatever she was given (on the occasion of her marriage). If a woman, under the apprehension of danger from her husband, desires divorce, she shall forfeit her claim to her property." A wife can abandon her husband if he is a bad character.

"A woman who has a right to claim maintenance for an unlimited period of time shall be given as much food and clothing (grasacchadana) as necessary for her, or more than is necessary in proportion to the income of the maintainer (yathapurushapari-vapam va). If the period (for which such things are to be given to her with one-tenth of the amount in addition) is limited, then a certain amount of money, fixed in proportion to the income of the maintainer, shall be given to her; so also if she has not been given her Sulka, property, and compensation (due to her for allowing her husband to re-marry). If she places herself under the protection of any one belonging to her father-in-law's family (Svasurakula), or if she begins to live independently, then her husband shall not be sued (for her maintenance). Thus the determination of maintenance is dealt with."

In the days of Kautilya there was no ban on woman or a widow remarrying:

"On the death of her husband a woman, desirous to lead a pious life, shall at once receive not only her endowment and jewellery (sthapyabharanam), but also the balance of Sulka due to her. If after obtaining these two things she re-married another, she shall be caused to pay them back together with interest (on their value). If

she is desirous of a second marriage (kutumbarkama), she shall be given on the occasion of her re-marriage (nivesakale) whatever either her father-in-law or her husband or both had given to her. The time at which women can re-marry shall be explained in connection with the subject of long sojourn of husbands.

“If a widow marries any man other than of her father-in-law’s selection (vasurapratilomyenanivishta), she shall forfeit whatever had been given to her by her father-in-law and her deceased husband.

“The kinsmen (gnatis) of a woman shall return to her old father-in-law whatever property of her own she had taken with her while re-marrying a kinsman. Whoever justly takes a woman under his protection shall equally protect her property. No woman shall succeed in her attempt to establish her title to the property of her deceased husband, after she re-marries.

“if she lives a pious life, she may enjoy it (dharmakama bhunjita). No woman with a son or sons shall (after re-marriage) be at liberty to make free use of her own property (stridhana); for that property of hers, her sons shall receive.

“If a woman after re-marriage attempts to take possession of her own property under the plea of maintaining her sons by her former husband, she shall be made to endow it in their name. If a woman has many male children by many husbands, then she shall conserve her property in the same condition as she had received from her husbands. Even that property which has been given her with full powers of enjoyment and disposal, a remarried woman shall endow in the name of her sons.

“A barren widow who is faithful to the bed of her dead husband may, under the protection of her teacher, enjoy her property as long as she lives; for it is to ward off calamities that women are endowed with property. On her death, her property shall pass into the hands of her kinsman (Dayada). If the husband is alive and the wife is dead, then her sons and daughters shall divide her property among themselves. If there are no sons, her daughters shall have it. In their absence her husband shall take that amount of money (sulka) which he had given her, and her relatives shall re-take whatever in the shape of gift or dowry they had presented her. Thus the determination of the property of a woman is dealt with.”

“Wives who belong to Sudra, Vaisya, Kshatriya or Brahman caste, and who have not given birth to children, should wait as long as a year, two, three and four years respectively for their husbands who have gone abroad for a short time; but if they are such as have

given birth to children, they should wait for their absent husbands for more than a year. If they are provided with maintenance, they should wait for twice the period of time just mentioned. If they are not so provided with, their well-to-do gnatis should maintain them either for four or eight years. Then the gnatis should leave them to marry, after taking what had been presented to them on the occasion of their marriages. If the husband is a Brahman, studying abroad, his wife who has no issue should wait for him for ten years; but if she has given birth to children, she should wait for twelve years. If the husband is a servant of the king, his wife should wait for him till her death; but even if she bears children to a savarna husband (i.e. a second husband belonging to the same gotra as that of the former husband), with a view to avoid the extinction of her race, she shall not be liable to contempt thereof (*savarnatascha prajata na' pavadam labheta*). If the wife of an absent husband lacks maintenance and is deserted by well-to-do gnatis, she may remarry one whom she likes and who is in a position to maintain her and relieve her misery."

Unlike Manu every precaution was taken to guarantee economic independence to a married woman. This is clear from the following provisions in Kautilya's Arthashastra relating to wife's endowment and maintenance:

"Means of subsistence (*vruti*) or jewellery (*abadhya*) constitutes what is called the property of a woman. Means of subsistence valued at above two thousand shall be endowed (in her name). There is no limit to jewellery. It is no guilt for the wife to make use of this property in maintaining her son, her daughter-in-law, or herself, whenever her absent husband has made no provision for her maintenance. In calamities, disease and famine, in warding off dangers and in charitable acts, the husband, too, may make use of this property. Neither shall there be any complaint against the enjoyment of this property by mutual consent by a couple who have brought forth a twin. Nor shall there be any complaint if this property has been enjoyed for three years by those who are wedded in accordance with the customs of the first four kinds of marriage. But the enjoyment of this property in the cases of Gandharva and Asura marriages shall be liable to be restored together with interest on it. In the case of such marriages as are called Rakshasa and Paisacha, the use of this property shall be dealt with as theft. Thus the duty of marriage is dealt with."

"A woman who has a right to claim maintenance for an unlimited period of time shall be given as much food and clothing



(grasachhadan) as is necessary for her, or more than is necessary in proportion to the income of the maintainer (yathapurushaparivapam va). If the period (for which such things are to be given to her with one-tenth of the amount in addition) is limited, then a certain amount of money, fixed in proportion to the income of the maintainer, shall be given to her; so also if she has not been given her sulka, property, and compensation (due to her for allowing her husband to re-marry). If she places herself under the protection of any one belonging to her father-in-law's family (svasurkula), or if she begins to live independently, then her husband shall not be sued (for her maintenance). Thus the determination of maintenance is dealt with."

Surprising as it may appear in Kautilya's time a wife could bring an action in a court of law against her husband for assault and defamation.

In short in pre-Manu days a woman was free and equal partner of man.

Why did Manu degrade her?

□ □



## PART IV

---

### Buddha or Karl Marx

*The Committee found three different typed copies of an essay on Buddha and Karl Marx in loose sheets, two of which have corrections in the author's own handwriting. After scrutinizing these, this essay is compiled incorporating the corrections. The essay is divided into sub-topics as shown below :*

#### *Introduction*

- 1. The Creed of the Buddha*
- 2. The Original Creed of Karl Marx*
- 3. What survives of the Marxian Creed*
- 4. Comparison between Buddha and Karl Marx*
- 5. Means*
- 6. Evaluation of Means*
- 7. Whose Means are More Efficacious?*
- 8. Withering away of the State—Editors.*



## CHAPTER 18

### Buddha or Karl Marx

A comparison between Karl Marx and Buddha may be regarded as a joke. There need be no surprise in this. Marx and Buddha are divided by 2381 years. Buddha was born in 563 B.C. and Karl Marx in 1818 A.D. Karl Marx is supposed to be the architect of a new ideology-polity—a new Economic system. The Buddha on the other hand is believed to be no more than the founder of a religion which has no relation to politics or economics. The heading of this essay “Buddha or Karl Marx” which suggests either a comparison or a contrast between two such personalities divided by such a lengthy span of time and occupied with different fields of thought is sure to sound odd. The Marxists may easily laugh at it and may ridicule the very idea of treating Marx and Buddha on the same level. Marx so modern and Buddha so ancient! The Marxists may say that the Buddha as compared to their master must be just primitive. What comparison can there be between two such persons? What could a Marxist learn from the Buddha? What can Buddha teach a Marxist? None-the-less a comparison between the two is a attractive and instructive. Having read both and being interested in the ideology of both a comparison between them just forces itself on me. If the Marxists keep back their prejudices and study the Buddha and understand what he stood for I feel sure that they will change their attitude. It is of course too much to expect that having been determined to scoff at the Buddha they will remain to pray. But this much can be said that they will realise that there is something in the Buddha’s teachings which is worth their while to take note of.

#### I THE CREED OF THE BUDDHA

The Buddha is generally associated with the doctrine of Ahimsa. That is taken to be the be-all and end-all of his teachings. Hardly any one knows that what the Buddha taught is something very vast; far beyond Ahimsa. It is therefore necessary to set out in detail his tenets. I enumerate them below as I have understood them from my reading of the Tripitaka :—

1. Religion is necessary for a free Society.
2. Not every Religion is worth having.
3. Religion must relate to facts of life and not to theories and speculations about God, or Soul or Heaven or Earth.
4. It is wrong to make God the centre of Religion.
5. It is wrong to make salvation of the soul as the centre of Religion.
6. It is wrong to make animal sacrifices to be the centre of religion.
7. Real Religion lives in the heart of man and not in the Shastras.
8. Man and morality must be the centre of Religion. If not, Religion is a cruel superstition.
9. It is not enough for Morality to be the ideal of life. Since there is no God it must become the law of life.
10. The function of Religion is to reconstruct the world and to make it happy and not to explain its origin or its end.
11. That the unhappiness in the world is due to conflict of interest and the only way to solve it is to follow the Ashtanga Marga.
12. That private ownership of property brings power to one class and sorrow to another.
13. That it is necessary for the good of Society that this sorrow be removed by removing its cause.
14. All human beings are equal.
15. Worth and not birth is the measure of man.
16. What is important is high ideals and not noble birth.
17. Maitri or fellowship towards all must never be abandoned. One owes it even to one's enemy.
18. Every one has a right to learn. Learning is as necessary for man to live as food is.
19. Learning without character is dangerous.
20. Nothing is infallible. Nothing is binding forever. Every thing is subject to inquiry and examination.
21. Nothing is final.
22. Every thing is subject to the law of causation.
23. Nothing is permanent or sanatan. Every thing is subject to change. Being is always Becoming.
24. War is wrong unless it is for truth and justice.
25. The victor has duties towards the vanquished.

This is the creed of the Buddha in a summary form. How ancient but how fresh! How wide and how deep are his teachings!

## II THE ORIGINAL CREED OF KARL MARX

Let us now turn to the creed of Karl Marx as originally propounded by him. Karl Marx is no doubt the father of modern socialism or Communism but he was not interested merely in propounding the theory of Socialism. That had been done long before him by others. Marx was more interested in proving that his Socialism was scientific. His crusade was as much against the capitalists as it was against those whom he called the Utopian Socialists. He disliked them both. It is necessary to note this point because Marx attached the greatest importance to the scientific character of his Socialism. All the doctrines which Marx propounded had no other purpose than to establish his contention that his brand of Socialism was scientific and not Utopian.

By scientific socialism what Karl Marx meant was that his brand of socialism was *inevitable* and *inescapable* and that society was moving towards it and that nothing could prevent its march. It is to prove this contention of his that Marx principally laboured.

Marx's contention rested on the following theses. They were :—

(i) That the purpose of philosophy is to reconstruct the world and not to explain the origin of the universe.

(ii) That the forces which shapes the course of history are primarily economic.

(iii) That society is divided into two classes, owners and workers.

(iv) That there is always a class conflict going on between the two classes.

(v) That the workers are exploited by the owners who misappropriate the surplus value which is the result of the workers' labour.

(vi) That this exploitation can be put an end to by nationalization of the instruments of production i.e. abolition of private property.

(vii) That this exploitation is leading to greater and greater impoverishment of the workers.

(viii) That this growing impoverishment of the workers is resulting in a revolutionary spirit among the workers and the conversion of the class conflict into a class struggle.

(ix) That as the workers outnumber the owners, the workers are bound to capture the State and establish their rule which he called the dictatorship of the proletariat.

(x) These factors are irresistible and therefore socialism is inevitable.

I hope I have reported correctly the propositions which formed the original basis of Marxian Socialism.

### III WHAT SURVIVES OF THE MARXIAN CREED

Before making a comparison between the ideologies of the Buddha and Karl Marx it is necessary to note how much of this original corpus of the Marxian creed has survived; how much has been disproved by history and how much has been demolished by his opponents.

The Marxian Creed was propounded sometime in the middle of the nineteenth century. Since then it has been subjected to much criticism. As a result of this criticism much of the ideological structure raised by Karl Marx has broken to pieces. There is hardly any doubt that Marxist claim that his socialism was inevitable has been completely disproved. The dictatorship of the Proletariat was first established in 1917 in one country after a period of something like seventy years after the publication of his *Das Capital* the gospel of socialism. Even when the Communism—which is another name for the dictatorship of the Proletariat—came to Russia, it did not come as something inevitable without any kind of human effort. There was a revolution and much deliberate planning had to be done with a lot of violence and blood shed, before it could step into Russia. The rest of the world is still waiting for coming of the Proletarian Dictatorship. Apart from this general falsification of the Marxian thesis that Socialism is inevitable, many of the other propositions stated in the lists have also been demolished both by logic as well as by experience. Nobody now accepts the economic interpretation of history as the only explanation of history. Nobody accepts that the proletariat has been progressively pauperised. And the same is true about his other premises.

What remains of the Karl Marx is a residue of fire, small but still very important. The residue in my view consists of four items :

- (i) The function of philosophy is to reconstruct the world and not to waste its time in explaining the origin of the world.
- (ii) That there is a conflict of interest between class and class.
- (iii) That private ownership of property brings power to one class and sorrow to another through exploitation.
- (iv) That it is necessary for the good of society that the sorrow be removed by the abolition of private property.

### IV COMPARISON BETWEEN BUDDHA AND KARL MARX

Taking the points from the Marxian Creed which have survived one may now enter upon a comparison between the Buddha and Karl Marx.

On the first point there is complete agreement between the Buddha and Karl Marx. To show how close is the agreement I quote below a part of the dialogue between Buddha and the Brahmin Potthapada.



"Then, in the same terms, Potthapada asked (the Buddha) each of the following questions :

1. Is the world not eternal?
2. Is the world finite?
3. Is the world infinite?
4. Is the soul the same as the body?
5. Is the soul one thing, and the body another?
6. Does one who has gained the truth live again after death?
7. Does he neither live again, nor not live again, after death?

And to each question the exalted one made the same reply : It was this.

"That too, Potthapada, is a matter on which I have expressed no opinion".

28. "But why has the Exalted One expressed no opinion on that?"

(Because) 'This question is not calculated to profit, it is not concerned with (the Dhamma) it does not redound even to the elements of right conduct, nor to detachment nor to purification from lust, nor to quietude, nor to tranquilisation of heart, nor to real knowledge, nor to the insight (of the higher stages of the Path), nor to Nirvana. Therefore it is that I express no opinion upon it."

On the second point I give below a quotation from a dialogue between Buddha and Pasenadi King of Kosala :

"Moreover, there is always strife going on between kings, between nobles, between Brahmins, between house holders, between mother and son, between son and father, between brother and sister, between sister and brother, between companion and companion..."

Although these are the words of Pasenadi, the Buddha did not deny that they formed a true picture of society.

As to the Buddha's own attitude towards class conflict his doctrine of Ashtanga Marga recognises that class conflict exists and that it is the class conflict which is the cause of misery.

On the third question I quote from the same dialogue of Buddha with Potthapada;

"Then what is it that the Exalted One has determined?"

"I have expounded, Potthapada, that sorrow and misery exist!"

I have expounded, what is the origin of misery. I have expounded what is the cessation of misery; I have expounded what is method by which one may reach the cessation of misery.

30. 'And why has the Exalted One put forth a statement as to that?'

'Because that questions Potthapada, is calculated to profit, is concerned with the Dhamma redounds to the beginnings of right

conduct, to detachment, to purification from lusts, to quitude, to tranquilisation of heart, to real knowledge, to the insight of the higher stages of the Path and to Nirwana. Therefore is it, Potthapada that I have put forward a statement as to that.'

That language is different but the meaning is the same. If for misery one reads exploitation Buddha is not away from Marx.

On the question of private property the following extract from a dialogue between Buddha and Ananda is very illuminating. In reply to a question by Ananda the Buddha said :

"I have said that avarice is because of possession. Now in what way that is so, Ananda, is to be understood after this manner. Where there is no possession of any sort or kind whatever by any one or anything, then there being no possession whatever, would there, owing to this cessation of possession, be any appearance of avarice?"

'There would not, Lord'.

'Wherefore, Ananda, just that is the ground, the basis, the genesis, the cause of avarice, to wit, possession.

31. 'I have said that tenacity is the cause possession. Now in what way that is so, Ananda, is to be understood after this manner. Were there no tenacity of any sort or kind whatever shown by any one with respect to any thing, then there being whatever, would there owing to this cessation of tenacity, be any appearance of possession?'

'There would not, Lord.'

'Wherefore, Ananda, just that is the ground, the basis, the genesis, the cause of possession, to wit tenacity.'

On the fourth point no evidence is necessary. The rules of the Bhikshu Sangh will serve as the best testimony on the subject.

According to the rules a Bhikku can have private property only in the following eight articles and no more. These eight articles are :—

1. }
2. } Three robes or pieces of cloth for daily wear.
3. }
4. a girdle for the loins.
5. an alms-bowl.
6. a razor.
7. a needle.
8. a water strainer.

Further a Bhikku was completely forbidden to receive gold or silver for fear that with gold or silver he might buy some thing beside the eight things he is permitted to have.

These rules are far more rigorous than are to be found in communism in Russia.

## V THE MEANS

We must now come to the means. The means of bringing about Communism which the Buddha propounded were quite definite. The means can be decided into three parts.

Part I consisted in observing the Pancha Silas.

The Enlightenment gave birth to a new gospel which contains the key to the solution of the problem which was haunting him.

The foundation of the New Gospel is the fact that the world was full of misery and unhappiness. It was fact not merely to be noted but to be regarded as being the first and foremost in any scheme of salvation. The recognition of this fact the Buddha made the starting point of his gospel.

To remove this misery and unhappiness was to him the aim and object of the gospel if it is to serve any useful purpose.

Asking what could be the causes of this misery the Buddha found that there could be only two.

A part of the misery and unhappiness of man was the result of his own misconduct. To remove this cause of misery he preached the practice of Panch Sila.

The Panch Sila comprised the following observations:

(1) To abstain from destroying or causing destruction of any living thing; (2) To abstain from stealing i.e. acquiring or keeping by fraud or violence, the property of another; (3) To Abstain from telling untruth; (4) To abstain from lust; (5) To abstain from intoxicating drinks.

A part of the misery and unhappiness in the world was according to the Buddha the result of man's inequity towards man. How was this inequity to be removed? For the removal of man's inequity towards man the Buddha prescribed the Noble Eight-Fold Path. The elements of the Noble Eight-Fold Path are:

(1) Right views i.e. freedom from superstition; (2) Right aims, high and worthy of the intelligent and earnest men; (3) Right speech i.e. kindly, open, truthful; (4) Right Conduct i.e. peaceful, honest and pure; (5) Right livelihood i.e. causing hurt or injury to no living being; (6) Right perseverance in all the other seven; (7) Right mindfulness i.e. with a watchful and active mind; and (8) Right contemplation i.e. earnest thought on the deep mysteries of life.

The aim of the Noble Eight-Fold Path is to establish on earth the kingdom of righteousness, and thereby to banish sorrow and unhappiness from the face of the world.

The third part of the Gospel is the doctrine of Nibbana. The doctrine of Nibbana is an integral part of the doctrine of the Noble Eight-Fold Path. Without Nibbana the realization of the Eight-Fold Path cannot be accomplished.

The doctrine of Nibbana tells what are the difficulties in the way of the realization of the Eight-Fold Path.

The chief of these difficulties are ten in number. The Buddha called them the Ten Asavas, Fetters or Hinderances.

The first hindrance is the delusion of self. So long as a man is wholly occupied with himself, chasing after every bauble that he vainly thinks will satisfy the cravings of his heart, there is no noble path for him. Only when his eyes have been opened to the fact that he is but a tiny part of a measureless whole, only when he begins to realize how impermanent a thing is his temporary individuality, can he even enter upon this narrow path.

The second is Doubt and Indecision. When a man's eyes are opened to the great mystery of existence, the impermanence of every individuality, he is likely to be assailed by doubt and indecision as to his action. To do or not to do, after all my individuality is impermanent, why do anything are questions, which make him indecisive or inactive. But that will not do in life. He must make up his mind to follow the teacher, to accept the truth and to enter on the struggle or he will get no further.

The third is dependence on the efficacy of Rites and Ceremonies. No good resolutions, however firm will lead to anything unless a man gets rid of ritualism; of the belief that any outward acts, any priestly powers, and holy ceremonies, can afford him an assistance of any kind. It is only when he has overcome this hindrance, that men can be said to have fairly entered upon the stream and has a chance sooner or later to win a victory.

The fourth consists of the bodily passions.

The fifth is ill-will towards other individuals.

The sixth is the suppression of the desire for a future life with a material body and the seventh is the desire for a future life in an immaterial world.

The eighth hindrance is Pride and ninth is Self-Righteousness. These are failings which it is most difficult for men to overcome, and to which superior minds are peculiarly liable—a Praisical contempt for those who are less able and less holy than themselves.

The tenth hindrance is ignorance. When all other difficulties are conquered this will even remain, the thorn in the flesh of the wise and good, the last enemy and the bitterest foe of man.

Nibbana consists in overcoming these hindrances to the pursuit of the Noble Eight-Fold Path.

The doctrine of the Noble Eight-Fold Path tells what disposition of the mind which a person should sedulously cultivate. The doctrine of Nibbana tells of the temptation or hindrance which a person should earnestly overcome if he wishes to trade along with the Noble Eight-Fold Path

The Fourth Part of the new Gospel is the doctrine of Paramitas.

The doctrine of Paraimitas inculcates the practice of ten virtues in one's daily life.

These are those ten virtues—(1) Panna (2) Sila (3) Nekkhamma (4) Dana (5) Virya (6) Khanti (7) Succha (8) Aditthana (9) Metta and (10) Upekkha.

Panna or wisdom is the light that removes the darkness of Avijja, Moha or Nescience. The Panna requires that one must get all his doubts removed by questioning those wiser than himself, associate with the wise and cultivate the different arts and sciences which help to develop the mind.

Sila is moral temperament, the disposition not to do evil and the disposition to do good; to be ashamed of doing wrong. To avoid to do evil for fear of punishment is Sila. Sila means fear of doing wrong.

Nekkhamma is renunciation of the pleasures of the world. 1

Dana means the giving of one's possessions, blood and limbs and even one's life for the good of the others without expecting anything in return.

Virya is right endeavour. It is doing with all your might with thought never turning back, whatever you have undertaken to do.

Khanti is forbearance. Not to meet hatred by hatred is the essence of it. For hatred is not appeased by hatred. It is appeased only by forbearance.

Succa is truth. An aspirant for Buddha never speak a lie. His speech is truth and nothing but truth.

Aditthana is resolute determination to reach the goal.

Metta is fellow-feeling extending to all beings, foe and friend, beast and man.

Upekkha is detachment as distinguished from indifference. It is a state of mind where there is neither like nor dislike. Remaining unmoved by the result and yet engaged in the pursuit of it.

These virtues one must practice to his utmost capacity. That is why they are called Paramitas (States of Perfection).

Such is the gospel the Buddha enunciated as a result of his enlightenment to end the sorrow and misery in the world.

It is clear that the means adopted by the Buddha were to convert a man by changing his moral disposition to follow the path voluntarily.

The means adopted by the Communists are equally clear, short and swift. They are (1) Violence and (2) Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

The Communists say that there are the only two means of establishing communism. The first is violence. Nothing short of it will suffice to break up the existing system. The other is dictatorship of the proletariat. Nothing short of it will suffice to continue the new system.

It is now clear what are the similarities and differences between Buddha and Karl Marx. The differences are about the means. The end is common to both.

## VI EVALUATION OF MEANS

We must now turn to the evaluation of means. We must ask whose means are superior and lasting in the long run. There are, however, some misunderstandings on both sides. It is necessary to clear them up.

Take violence. As to violence there are many people who seem to shiver at the very thought of it. But this is only a sentiment. Violence cannot be altogether dispensed with. Even in non-communist countries a murderer is hanged. Does not hanging amount to violence? Non-Communist countries go to war with non-Communist countries. Millions of people are killed. Is this no violence? If a murderer can be killed, because he has killed a citizen, if a soldier can be killed in war because he belongs to a hostile nation why cannot a property owner be killed if his ownership leads to misery for the rest of humanity? There is no reason to make an exception in favour of the property owner, why one should regard private property as sacrosanct.

The Buddha was against violence. But he was also in favour of justice and where justice required he permitted the use of force. This is well illustrated in his dialogue with Sinha Senapati the Commander-in-Chief of Vaishali. Sinha having come to know that the Buddha preached Ahimsa went to him and asked:

“The Bhagvan preaches Ahimsa. Does the Bhagvan preach an offender to be given freedom from punishment? Does the Bhagvan preach that we should not go to war to save our wives, our children and our wealth? Should we suffer at the hands of criminals in the name of Ahimsa.?”

“Does the Tathagata prohibit all war even when it is in the interest of Truth and Justice?”

Buddha replied, You have wrongly understood what I have been preaching. An offender must be punished and an innocent man must be freed. It is not a fault of the Magistrate if he punishes an offender. The cause of punishment is the fault of the offender. The Magistrate who inflicts the punishment is only carrying out the law. He does not become stained with Ahimsa. A man who fights for justice and safety cannot be accused of Ahimsa. If all the means of maintaining peace have failed then the responsibility for Himsa falls on him who starts war. One must never surrender to evil powers. War there may be. But it must not be for selfish ends....”

There are of course other grounds against violence such as those urged by Prof. John Dewey. In dealing with those who contend that the end justifies the means is morally perverted doctrine, Dewey has rightly asked what can justify the means if not the end? It is only the end that can justify the means.

Buddha would have probably admitted that it is only the end which would justify the means. What else could? And he would have said that if the end justified violence, violence was a legitimate means for the end in view. He certainly would not have exempted property owners from force if force was the only means for that end. As we shall see his means for the end were different. As prof. Dewey has pointed out that violence is only another name for the use of force and although force must be used for creative purposes a distinction between use of force as energy and use of force as violence needs to be made. The achievement of an end involves the destruction of many other ends which are integral with the one that is sought to be destroyed. Use of force must be so regulated that it should save as many ends as possible in destroying the evil one. Buddha's Ahimsa was not as absolute as the Ahimsa preached by Mahavira the founder of Jainism. He would have allowed force only as energy. The Communists preach Ahimsa as an absolute principle. To this the Buddha was deadly opposed.

As to Dictatorship the Buddha would have none of it. He was born a democrat and he died a democat. At the time he lived there were 14 monarchical states and 4 republics. He belonged to the Sakyas and the Sakya's kingdom was a republic. He was extremely in love with Vaishali which was his second home because it was a republic. Before his Mahaparinirbhan he spent his Varshavasa in Vaishali. After the completion of his Varshavasa he decided to leave Vaishali and go elsewhere as was his wont. After going some distance he looked back

on Vaishali and said to Ananda. "This is the last look of Vaishali which the Tathagata is having". So fond was he of this republic.

He was a thorough equalitarian. Originally the Bhikkus, including the Buddha himself, wore robes made of rags. This rule was enunciated to prevent the aristocratic classes from joining the Sangh. Later Jeevaka the great physician prevailed upon the Buddha to accept a robe which was made of a whole cloth. The Buddha at once altered the rule and extended it to all the monks.

Once the Buddha's mother Mahaprajapati Gotami who had joined the Bhikkuni Sangh heard that the Buddha had got a chill. She at once started preparing a scarf for him. After having completed it she took to the Buddha and asked him to wear it. But he refused to accept it saying that if it is a gift it must be a gift to the whole Sangh and not to an individual member of the Sangh. She pleaded and pleaded but he refused to yield.

The Bhikshu Sangh had the most democratic constitution. He was only one of the Bhikkus. At the most he was like a Prime Minister among members of the Cabinet. He was never a dictator. Twice before his death he was asked to appoint some one as the head of the Sangh to control it. But each time he refused saying that the Dhamma is the Supreme Commander of the Sangh. He refused to be a dictator and refused to appoint a dictator.

What about the value of the means? Whose means are superior and lasting in the long run?

Can the Communists say that in achieving their valuable end they have not destroyed other valuable ends? They have destroyed private property. Assuming that this is a valuable end can the Communists say that they have not destroyed other valuable end in the process of achieving it? How many people have they killed for achieving their end. Has human life no value? Could they not have taken property without taking the life of the owner?

Take dictatorship. The end of Dictatorship is to make the Revolution a permanent revolution. This is a valuable end. But can the Communists say that in achieving this end they have not destroyed other valuable ends? Dictatorship is often defined as absence of liberty or absence of Parliamentary Government. Both interpretations are not quite clear. There is no liberty even when there is Parliamenatary Governmant. For law means want of liberty. The difference between Dictatorship and Parliamentary Govt. lies in this. In Parliamentary Government every citizen has a right to criticise the restraint on liberty imposed by the Government. In Parliamentary Government you have



a duty and a right; the duty to obey the law and right to criticise it. In Dictatorship you have only duty to obey but no right to criticise it.

## VII WHOSE MEANS ARE MORE EFFICACIOUS

We must now consider whose means are more lasting. One has to choose between Government by force and Government by moral disposition.

As Burke has said force cannot be a lasting means. In his speech on conciliation with America he uttered this memorable warning :

“First, Sir, permit me to observe, that the use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment; but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again; and a nation is not governed which is perpetually to be conquered.”

“My next objection is its uncertainty. Terror is not always the effect of force, and an armament is not a victory. If you do not succeed, you are without resource, for, conciliation failing, force remains; but force failing, no further hope of reconciliation is left. Power and authority are sometimes bought by kindness; but they can never be begged as alms by an impoverished and defeated violence.

A further objection to force is, that you impair the object by your very endeavours to preserve it. The thing you fought for is the thing which you recover, but depreciated, sunk, wasted and consumed in the contest.”

In a sermon addressed to the Bhikkus the Buddha has shown the difference between the rule by Righteousness and Rule by law i.e. force. Addressing the Brethren he said :

(2) Long long ago, brethren, there was Sovereign overlord named Strongtyre, a king ruling in righteousness, lord of the four quarters of the earth, conqueror, the protector of his people. He was the possessor of the celestial wheel. He lived in supremacy over this earth to its ocean bounds, having conquered it, not by the courage, not by the sword, but by righteousness.

(3) Now, brethren, after many years, after many hundred years, after many thousand years, king Strongtyre command a certain man, saying:

“Thou shouldest see, Sir, the Celestial Wheel has sunk a little, has slipped down from its place, bring me word.”

Now after many many hundred years had slipped down from its place On seeing this he went to King Strongtyre and said: “Know, sire, for a truth that the Celestial Wheel has sunk, has slipped down from its place.”

The king Strongtyre, brethren, let the prince his eldest son be sent for and spake thus:

‘Behold, dear boy, my Celestial Wheel has sunk a little, has slipped down from its place. Now it has been told me; If the Celestial Wheel of a wheel turning King shall sink down, shall slip down from its place, that king has not much longer to live. I have had my fill of human pleasures; ‘It’s time to seek after divine joys, Come, dear boy, take thou charge over this earth bounded by the ocean. But I, shaving hair and beard, and donning yellow robes, will go forth from home into the homeless state.

So brethren, King Strongtyre, having in due form established his eldest son on the throne, shaved hair and beared, donned yellow robes and went forth from home into homeless state. But on the seventh day after the royal hermit had gone forth, the Celestial Wheel disappeared.

(4) Then a certain man went to the King, and told him, saying: Know, O King, for a truth, that the Celestial Wheel has disappeared!

Then that King, brethren, was grieved thereat and afflicted with sorrow. And he went to the royal hermit, and told him, saying: Know, sire, for a truth, that the Celestial Wheel has disappeared.

And the anointed king so saying, the royal hermit made reply. Grieve thou not, dear son, that the Celestial Wheel has disappeared, nor be afflicted that the Celestial Wheel has disappeared. For no paternal heritage of thine, dear son, is the Celestial Wheel. But verily, dear son, turn thou in the Ariyan turning of the Wheel-turners. (Act up to the noble ideal of duty set before themselves by the true sovereigns of the world). Then it may well be that if thou carry out the Ariyan duty of a Wheel-turning Monarch, and on the feast of the moon thou wilt for, with bathed head to keep the feast on the chief upper terrace, to the Celestial Wheel will manifest, itself with its thousand spokes its tyre, navel and all its part complete.

(5) ‘But what, sire is this Ariya duty of a Wheel-turning Monarch?’

This, dear son, that thou, leaning on the Norm (the law of truth and righteousness) honouring, respecting and revering it, doing homage to it, hallowing it, being thyself a Norm-banner, a Norm-signal, having the Norm as thy master, shouldest provide the right watch, ward, and protection for thine own folk, for the army, for the nobles, for vassals, for brahmins and house holders, for town and country dwellers, for the religious world, and for beasts and birds. Throughout thy kingdom let no wrong doing prevail. And whosoever in thy kingdom is poor, to him let wealth be given.

‘And when dear son, in thy kingdom men of religious life, renouncing the carelessness arising from intoxication of the senses, and

devoted to forbearance and sympathy, each mastering self, each claiming self, each protecting self, shall come to thee from time to time, and question thee concerning what is good and what is bad, what is criminal and what is not, what is to be done and what is to be left undone, what line of action will in the long run work for weal or for woe, thou shouldest hear what they have to say and thou shouldest deter them from evil, and bid them take up what is good. This, dear son, is the Ariyan duty of a sovereign of the world.'

'Even so,' sire, answered the anointed king, and obeying, carried out the Ariyan duty of a sovereign lord. To him, thus behaving, when on the feast of the full moon he had gone in the observance with bathed head to the chief upper terrance the Celestial Wheel revealed itself, with its thousand spokes, its tyre, its naval, and all its part complete. And seeing this is occured to the king: 'It has been told me that a king to whom on such a occasion the Celestial Wheel reveals itself completely, becomes a Wheel-turning monarch. May I even I also become a sovereign of the world.'

(6) Then brethren, the king arose from his seat and uncovering his robe from one shoulder, took in his left hand a pitcher, and with his right hand sprinkled up over the Celestial Wheel, saying: 'Roll onward, O Lord Wheel! Go forth and overcome, O Lord Wheel!'

Then, brethern, the Celestial Wheel rolled onwards towards the region of the East, and after it went the Wheel-turning king, and with him his army, horses and chariots and elephants and men. And in whatever place, brethren, the wheel stopped, there the king, the victorious war-lord, took up his abode, and with him his fourfold army. Then the all, the rival kings in the region of the East came to the sovereign king and said 'Come, O mighty king! Welcome, O mighty king! All is thine, O mighty King! Teach us, O mighty king!'

The king, the sovereign war-lord, spake thus: 'Ye shall slay no living thing. Ye shall not take that which has not been given. Ye shall not act wrongly touching bodily desires. Ye shall speak no lie. Ye shall drink no maddening drink. Enjoy your possessions as you have been wont to do.'

(7) Then, brethern, the Celestial Wheel, plunging down to the Eastern ocean, rose up out again, and rolled onwards to the region of the south.... (and there all happened as had happend in the East). And in like manner the Celestial Wheel, plunging into Southern ocean, rose up out again and rolled onward to the region of the West... and of the North; and there too happened as had hapened in the Soutern and West.

Then when the Celestial Wheel had gone forth conquering over the whole earth to its ocean boundry, it returned to the royal city, and stood, so that one might think it fixed, in front of the judgement hall at entrance to the inner apartments of the king, the Wheel-turner, lighting up with its glory the facade of the inner apartments of the king, the sovereign of the world.

(8) And a second king, brethern, also a Wheel-turning monarch; . . . and a third . . . and a fourth . . . and a fifth . . . and a sixth . . . and a seventh king, a victorious war-lord, after many years, after many hundred years, after many thousand years, command a certain man, saying :

‘If thou should’st see, sirrah, that the Celestial Wheel has sunk down, has slid from its place, bring me word.’

‘Even so, sire,’ replied the man.

So after many years, after many hundred years, after many thousand years, that man saw that the Celestial Wheel had sunk down, had become dislodged from its place. And so seeing he went to the king, the war-lord, and told him.

Then that king did (even as Strongtyre had done). And on the seventh day after the royal hermit had gone forth the Celestial Wheel disappeared.

Then a certain man went and told the King. Then the King was grieved at the disappearance of the wheel, and afflicted with grief. But he did not go to the hermit-king to ask concerning the Ariyan Duty of sovereign war-lord. But his own ideas, forsooth, he governed his people; and they so governed differently from what they had been, did not prosper as they used to do under former kings who had carried out the Arivan duty of a sovereign king.

Then, brethren, the ministers and courtiers, the finance officials, the guards and door keepers and they who lived by sacred verses came to the King and spake thus :

‘Thy people, O king, whilst thou governest them by thine own ideas, differently from the way to which they were used when former kings were carrying out the Arivan Duty prosper not. Now there are in thy kingdom ministers and courtiers, finance officers, guards and custodians, and they who live by sacred verses—both all of us and others—who keep the knoweledge of the Ariyan duty of the sovereign king. Lo ! O king. do thou ask us concerning it; to thee thus asking will we declare it.’

9. Then, brethren, the king, having made the ministers and all the rest sit down together, asked them about the Ariyan duty of Sovereign war-lord, And they declared it unto him. And when he had heard

them, he did provide the due watch and ward protection, but on the destitute he bestowed no wealth and because this was not done, poverty became widespread.

When poverty was thus become rife, a certain man took that which others had not given him, what people call by theft. Him they caught, and brought before the king, saying: 'This man, O king has taken that which was not given to him and that is theft'.

Thereupon the king spake thus to the man. 'Is it true sirrah, that thou hast taken what no man gave thee, hast committed what men call theft.'

'It is ture, O king.'

'But why?'

'O king, I have nothing to keep me alive.' Then the king bestowed wealth on that man, saying: 'With this wealth sir, do thou both keep thyself alive, maintain thy parents, maintain children and wife, carry on thy business.'

'Even so, O king,' replied the man.

10. Now another man, brethern, took by theft what was not given him. Him they caught and brought before the king and told him, saying: 'this man, O king, hath taken by theft what was not given him'.

And the king (spoke and did even as he had spoken and done to the former man.)

11. Now men heard brethren, that to them who had taken by theft what was not given them, the King was giving wealth. And hearing they thought, let us then take by theft what has not been given us.

Now a certain man did so. And him they caught and charged before the king who (as before) asked him why he had stolen.

'Because, O king I cannot maintain myself'.

Then the king thought: If I bestow wealth on anyone so ever who has taken by theft what was not given him, there will be hereby and increase of this stealing. Let me now put final stop to this and inflict condign punishment on him, have his head cut off!

So he bade his man saying: 'Now look ye! bind this man's arms behind him with a strong rope and tight knot, shave his head bald, lead him around with a harsh sounding drum, from road to road, from cross ways to cross ways, take him out by the southern gate and to the south of the town, put a final stop to this, inflict on him uttermost penalty, cut of his head.'

'Even so , O king' answered the men, and carried out his commands.

12. Now men heard, brethren, that they who took by theft what was not given them were thus put to death. And hearing they thought:

Let us also now have sharp swords made ready for themselves, and them from whom we take what is not given us—what they call them—let us put a final stop to them, inflict on them uttermost penalty, and their heads off.

And they got themselves sharp swords, and came forth to sack village and town and city, and to work highway robbery. And then whom they robbed they made an end of, cutting off their heads.

13. Thus, brethren, from goods not being bestowed on the destitute poverty grieve rife; from poverty growing rife stealing increased, from the spread of stealing violence grew space, from the growth of violence the destruction of life common, from the frequency of murder both the span of life in those beings and their comeliness also (diminished).

Now among humans of latter span of life, brethren, a certain took by theft what was not given him and even as those others was accused before the king and questioned if it was true that he had stolen.

‘Nay, O king,’ he replied, ‘they are deliberately telling lies.’

14. Thus from goods not being bestowed on the destitute, poverty grew rife... stealing... violence... murder... until lying grew common.

Again a certain man reported to the king, saying: ‘such and such a man, O king! has taken by theft what was not given him’—thus speaking evil of him.

15. And so, brethren, from goods not being bestowed on the destitute poverty grew rife... stealing... violence... murder... lying... evil speaking grew abundant.

16. From lying there grew adultery.

17. Thus from goods not being bestowed on the destitute, poverty... stealing... violence... murder... lying... evil speaking... immorality grew rife.

18. Among (them) brethren, three things grew space incest, wanton greed and perverted lust.

Then these things grew apace lack of filial piety to mother and father, lack of religious piety to holy men, lack of regard for the head of the clan.

19. There will come a time, brethren, when the descendants of those humans will have a life-span of ten years. Among humans of this life-span, maidens of five years will be of a marriageable age. Among such humans these kinds of tastes (savours) will disappear; ghee, butter, oil of tila, sugar, salt. Among such humans kudrusa grain will be the highest kind of food. Even as to-day rice and curry is the highest kind of food, so will kudrusa grain will be then. Among such humans the ten moral courses of conduct will altogether disappear, the ten

immoral courses of action will flourish excessively; there will be no word for moral among such humans, the ten moral courses of conduct will altogether disappear, the ten immoral courses of action will flourish excessively, there will be no word for moral among such humans—far less any moral agent. Among such humans, brethren, they who lack filian and religious piety, and show no respect for the Head of the clan—'tis they to whom homage and praise will be given, just as to-day homage and praise are given to the filial minded, to the pious and to them who respect the heads of their clans.

20. Among such humans, brethren, there will be no (such thoughts of reverence as are a bar to intermarriage with) mother, or mother's sister, or mother's sister-in-law, or teacher's wife, or father's sister-in-law. The world will fall into promiscuity, like goats and sheep, fowls and swine, dogs and jackals.

Among such humans, brethren keen mutual enmity will become the rule, keen ill-will, keen animosity, passionate thoughts even of killing, in a mother towards her child, in a child towards its father, in brother to brother, in brother to sister, in sister to brother. Just a sportsman feels towards the game that he sees, so will they feel.

This is probably the finest picture of what happens when moral force fails and brutal force takes its place. What the Buddha wanted was that each man should be morally so trained that he may himself become a sentinal for the kingdom of righteousness.

### VIII WITHERING AWAY OF THE STATE

The Communists themselves admit that their theory of the State as a permanent dictatorship is a weakness in their political philosophy. They take shelter under the plea that the State will ultimately wither away. There are two questions which they have to answer. When will it wither away? What will take the place of the State when it withers away? To the first question they can give no definite time. Dictatorship for a short period may be good and a welcome thing even for making Democracy safe. Why should not Dictatorship liquidate itself after it has done its work, after it has removed all the obstacles and boulders in the way of democracy and has made the path of Democracy safe. Did not Asoka set an example? He practised violence against the Kalingas. But thereafter he renounced violence completely. If our victors to-day not only disarm their victims but also disarm themselves there would be peace all over the world.

The Communists have given no answer. At any rate no satisfactory answer to the question what would take the place of the State when it withers away, though this question is more important than the

question when the State will wither away. Will it be succeeded by Anarchy? If so the building up of the Communist State is an useless effort. If it cannot be sustained except by force and if it results in anarchy when the force holding it together is withdrawn what good is the Communist State.

The only thing which could sustain it after force is withdrawn is Religion. But to the Communists Religion is anathema. Their hatred to Religion is so deep seated that they will not even discriminate between religions which are helpful to Communism and religions which are not. The Communists have carried their hatred of Christianity to Buddhism without waiting to examine the difference between the two. The charge against Christianity levelled by the Communists was two-fold. Their first charge against Christianity was that they made people otherworldliness and made them suffer poverty in this world. As can be seen from quotations from Buddhism in the earlier part of this tract such a charge cannot be levelled against Buddhism.

The second charge levelled by the Communists against Christianity cannot be levelled against Buddhism. This charge is summed up in the statement that Religion is the opium of the people. This charge is based upon the Sermon on the Mount which is to be found in the Bible. The Sermon on the Mount sublimates poverty and weakness. It promises heaven to the poor and the weak. There is no Sermon on the Mount to be found in the Buddha's teachings. His teaching is to acquire wealth. I give below his Sermon on the subject to Anathapindika one of his disciples.

Once Anathapindika came to where the Exalted One was staying. Having come he made obeisance to the Exalted One and took a seat at one side and asked 'Will the Enlightened One tell what things are welcome, pleasant, agreeable, to the householder but which are hard to gain.'

The Enlightened One having heard the question put to him said 'Of such things the first is to acquire wealth lawfully.'

'The second is to see that your relations also get their wealth lawfully.'

'The third is to live long and reach great age.'

'Of a truth, householder, for the attainment of these four things, which in the world are welcome, pleasant agreeable but hard to gain, there are also four conditions precedent. They are the blessing of faith, the blessing of virtuous conduct, the blessing of liberality and the blessing of wisdom.



The Blessing of virtuous conduct which abstains from taking life, thieving, unchastity, lying and partaking of fermented liquor.

The blessing of liberality consists in the householder living with mind freed from the taint of avarice, generous, open-handed, delightening in gifts, a good one to be asked and devoted to the distribution of gifts.

Wherein consists the blessing of Wisdom? He know that an householder who dwells with mind overcome by greed, avarice, ill-will, sloth, drowsiness, distraction and flurry, and also about, commits wrongful deeds and neglects that which ought to be done, and by so doing deprived of happiness and honour.

Greed, avarice, ill-will, sloth and drowsiness, distraction and flurry and doubt are stains of the mind. An householder who gets rid of such stains of the mind acquires great wisdom, abundant wisdom, clear vision and perfect wisdom.

Thus to acquire wealth legitimately and justly, earn by great industry, amassed by strength of the arm and gained by sweat of the brow is a great blessing. The householder makes himself happy and cheerful and preserves himself full of happiness; also makes his parents, wife, and children, servants, and labourers, friends and companions happy and cheerful, and preserves them full of happiness.

The Russians do not seem to be paying any attention to Buddhism as an ultimate aid to sustain Communism when force is withdrawn.

The Russians are proud of their Communism. But they forget that the wonder of all wonders is that the Buddha established Communism so far as the Sangh was concerned without dictatorship. It may be that it was a communism on a very small scale but it was communism without dictatorship a miracle which Lenin failed to do.

The Buddha's method was different. His method was to change the mind of man: to alter his disposition: so that whatever man does, he does it voluntarily without the use of force or compulsion. His main means to alter the disposition of men was his Dhamma and the constant preaching of his Dhamma. The Buddhas way was not to force people to do what they did not like to do although it was good for them. His way was to alter the disposition of men so that they would do voluntarily what they would not otherwise to do.

It has been claimed that the Communist Dictatorship in Russia has wonderful achievements to its credit. There can be no denial of it. That is why I say that a Russian Dictatorship would be good for all backward countries. But this is no argument for permanent Dictatorship. Humanity does not only want economic values, it also wants spiritual values to be retained. Permanent Dictatorship has paid

no attention to spiritual values and does not seem to intend to. Carlyle called Political Economy a Pig Philosophy. Carlyle was of course wrong. For man needs material comforts. But the Communist Philosophy seems to be equally wrong for the aim of their philosophy seems to be fatten pigs as though men are no better than pigs. Man must grow materially as well as spiritually. Society has been aiming to lay a new foundation was summarised by the French Revolution in three words, Fraternity, Liberty and Equality. The French Revolution was welcomed because of this slogan. It failed to produce equality. We welcome the Russian Revolution because it aims to produce equality. But it cannot be too much emphasized that in producing equality society cannot afford to sacrifice fraternity or liberty. Equality will be of no value without fraternity or liberty. It seems that the three can co-exist only if one follows the way of the Buddha. Communism can give one but not all.

□ □

## PART V

---

### Schemes of Books

*The scheme of 'What the Brahmins have done to the Hindus?' is in printed form. All other schemes are typed.—Editors.*



# CHAPTER 19

## Schemes of Books

No. 1

### REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN ANCIENT INDIA

#### *Table of Contents*

- Book I The Age of Racial Conflict
- Book II The Conflict over Inequality
- Book III How Conflict lead to Revolution
- Book IV Results of Revolution
- Book V The Birth of Counter-Revolution
- Book VI Results of Counter-Revolution
- Book VII The Present Age is the Age of Counter-Revolution.

#### BOOK—I

##### Part I *The Age of Social Conflict*

- Chapter 1 The Indo Iranians
- Chapter 2 The Aryans v/s Nagas
- Chapter 3 The Aryans v/s Brahamins
- Chapter 4 The Attempt to Reconciliation.

## BOOK—II

*The Rise of Inequality*

- Chapter 1 Rise of Brahamandom
- Chapter 2 Infallibility of the Vedas
- Chapter 3 Graded Inequality the Essence of Chaturvarna
- Chapter 4 The Shudra under graded Inequality.

## BOOK—III

Part I *The Revolution and Its Principles*

- Chapter 1 The Rise of Buddhism as a Revolutionary Force
- Chapter 2 Equality as the Principle of the Revolution
- Chapter 3 Reason and not Faith
- Chapter 4 Freedom of Thought

Part II *Effects of Revolution on Society*

- Chapter 1 Social effects of the Revolution
- Chapter 2 Political effects of the Revolution
- Chapter 3 Elevation of Woman

Part III *Political effects of the Revolution*

## BOOK—IV

Part I *Causes of Counter-Revolution*

- Chapter 1 Regicide or the Birth of Counter-Revolution
- Chapter 2 Manu Smriti or the Gospel of Counter-Revolution

Part II *The Social Effects of Counter-Revolution*

- Chapter 1 The Deification of the Brahmin
- Chapter 2 The Installation of the Brahmins as Rulers
- Chapter 3 The Suppression of the Shudras
- Chapter 4 The Degradation of Women

Part III *The Struggle between Revolution and Counter-Revolution*

- Chapter 1
- Chapter 2
- Chapter 3
- Chapter 4

Part IV *Social Effects of Revolution*

- Chapter 1
- Chapter 2
- Chapter 3
- Chapter 4

Part V *The Triumph of Counter-Revolution*

- Chapter 1
- Chapter 2
- Chapter 3
- Chapter 4

Part VI *The Present Age is the Age of  
Counter-Revolution*

Chapter 1

Chapter 2

Chapter 3

Chapter 4

Part VII *Constitution of Counter-Revolution*

Chapter 1

Chapter 2

Chapter 3

Chapter 4

No. 2

WHAT THE BRAHMINS HAVE DONE TO THE HINDUS

Part I *The Making of the Hindu Society*

Chapter 1 The Growth of Hindu Religion

Chapter 2 Hinduism And Its Symbols

Chapter 3 The Rock on which it is Built

Part II *The Riddles of Hinduism*

Chapter 4 The Supremacy of the Brahmin

Chapter 5 The Fall of the Shudra

Chapter 6 The Degradation of Woman

Chapter 7 Beef-Eating v/s Vegetarianism

Chapter 8 Vedas v/s Vedanta

Chapter 9 Rise of Shiva and Vishnu

Chapter 10 Worship of Rama and Krishna

Chapter 11 Bhagvat Gita—Peace for War



Part III *The Holy Brahmin Empire*

- Chapter 12 The Brahminic Revolution
- Chapter 13 The Causes of the Revolution
- Chapter 14 Manu the Philosopher of the Revolution
- Chapter 15 The Political and Social Philosophy of the Brahmanic Revolution
- Chapter 16 Brahmanic Rule in Action

Part IV *Hinduism and the Legacy of Brahmanism*

- Chapter 17 The Disease of Graded Inequality
- Chapter 18 The Debasement of Man
- Chapter 19 The Degradation of Religion
- Chapter 20 The Darkening of the Mind
- Chapter 21 The Deadening of Conscience
- Chapter 22 The Depreciation of Life
- Chapter 23 The Death Knell of Democracy

Part V *Brahminism and Modern India*

- Chapter 24 Brahmins and Administration
- Chapter 25 Brahmins and Politics
- Chapter 26 Brahmins and Labour

Part VI *Brahmins v/s Hindus*

- Chapter 27 What Ails the Hindus
- Chapter 28 The British and Brahmins
- Chapter 29 The Remedy for the Disease

*Note:—This scheme is found in print. Rest of the schemes are in typed form*

No. 3

## CAN I BE A HINDU ?

### SYMBOLS OF HINDUISM

1. Symbols represent the Soul of a Thing
2. Symbols of Christianity
3. Symbols of Islam
4. Symbols of Jainism
5. Symbols of Buddhism
6. What is Hinduism;  
Undefinable something
7. What are the Symbols of Hinduism  
Three
  - (1) Caste
  - (2) Cults
    - (1) Rama
    - (2) Krishna
    - (3) Shiva
    - (4) Vishnu
  - (3) Service of Superman

No. 4

## INDIA AND COMMUNISM

### Part I *The Pre-Requisites of Communism*

- Chapter 1 The Birth-place of Communism
- Chapter 2 Communism and Democracy
- Chapter 3 Communism and Social Order

### Part II *India and the Pre-Requisites of Communism*

- Chapter 4 The Hindu Social Order
- Chapter 5 The Basis of the Hindu Social Order
- Chapter 6 Impediments to Communism arising from the Social Order

### Part III *What then shall we do ?*

- I Marx and the European Social Order
- II Manu and the Hindu Social Order

No. 5

## ESSAYS ON THE BHAGVAT GITA

*Table of Contents*Essay I *What made Arjun agree to fight ?*

- (1) Was it because Krishna met his objections ?  
or
- (2) Because of the command of Krishna

Essay II *What does the Bhagvat Gita teach ?*

- (1) Does it teach Sankhyayog ?
- (2) Does it teach Dnyanyoga ?
- (3) Does it teach Karmayoga ?
- (4) Does it teach Bhaktiyoga ?
- (5) Conclusion

Essay III *Was Gita a part of the original Mahabharat ?*

- (1) Gita and the Udyoga Parva
- (2) The first mention of Gita in the stream of  
Sanskrit Literature
- (3) When was the Bhagvat Gita written ?

Essay IV *Why was the Bhagvat Gita written ?*

- (1) Was the necessity Social ?
- (2) Was the necessity Religious ?

Essay V *Gita and Buddhism*

by  
B R Ambedkar

68

## Symbols of Hinduism

1. Symbols represent the Soul of a Hindu,
  2. of Christianity -
  3. of Islam
  4. Symbols of Jainism
  5. Symbols of Buddhism
  6. What ~~are the Symbols of Hinduism~~ is  
+ undefinable something
  7. What ~~are the Symbols of Hinduism~~ symbols of Hinduism
- Two Three
- (1) Caste
  - (2) Caste

(1) Rama

(2) Krishna

(3) Shiva

(4) Vishnu

(3) Source of Superman

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar

Virat Parva

1. The spies sent by Kamevas to search for the existence of the Pandavas return to Duryodhan and tell him that they are unable to discover them. They ask his permission as to what to do. — Bh. Virat-Parva. Arhya 25.
2. Duryodhan asks for advice from his advisers. Karna said send other spies. Dushashan said they might have gone beyond the sea. But search for them. — Ibid - Arhya 26.
3. Drona said the Pandavas are not likely to be defeated or destroyed. They may be living as Tapasis. Therefore send Siddhas and Brahmanis as spies — Ibid Arhya 27.
4. Bhishma supports Drona — Ibid Arhya 28.
5. Kripacharya supported Bhishma and added - Pandavas are great enemies. But wise man does not neglect even small enemies while they are in अज्ञाने you should go on collecting armises from now. — Ibid. Arhya - 29.
6. Then ~~the~~ Susharma King of Trigarth raised quite a different subject. He said that Kichaka who was the

**B. R. AMBEDKAR,**  
*M.A., Ph.D., D.Sc., LL.D., D.Litt., Barrister-at-Law,  
Member, Council of States.*

26, ALIPORE ROAD,  
CIVIL LINES,  
DELHI,

Dated the 12th June, 1956.

My dear Rege,

I have returned the Marathi Edition of the Mahabharat. It seems that along with your copies my edition has also been taken away. Will you kindly send me the Marathi translation of the Adi Parwar by registered post. My work on the Revolution and Counter Revolution has been held up. Treat this as most urgent.

Yours sincerely,



(B.R. Ambedkar)

Shri S. Rege,  
Librarian,  
Siddharth College,  
Bombay.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*The books and journals listed here include the works cited by the author. The details about the publications have been searched out from the Bombay University Library. Still details of some of the books could not be had before the release of this Volume.*

Adams, D. S. : *Theology* (Hastings Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. XII).

Adelphi : *The Nemesis of Ineffective Religion* (1941).

Altekar, Anant Sadashiv : *Sources of Hindu Dharma in its Socio-religious aspect* (Pub. Sholapur Institute of Public Administration). Name of the article: *The Position of Smritis as a Source of Dharma*—Kane Memorial Volume.

Ambedkar, Dr. B. R. : *Annihilation of Castes* (New Book Co., Bombay 1936).

—*Castes in India* (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLVI, 1917, pp. 81-95).

—*Who were the Shudras?* (Thacker & Co., Rampart Row, Bombay 1, 1st Ed., 1946).

First two of these books are included in Vol. 1 of the present series. Third one will be out in due course.

Baines, Sir J. A. : *Census of India Report* (1881).

Boudhayana : *Grihya Sutras*.

Beard : *Freedom in Political Thought* (in 'Freedom—Its Meaning', Ed. by Ruth Nanda Kishan).

Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna : *Vedant Philosophy* (Basu-Mallik Lectures—University of Calcutta); (Poona, 1929, 1st part).

Bergson : *Two Sources of Morality*.

Bhandarkar, Sir Ramkrishna Gopal : *Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems* (Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research) (Strassburg, Karl J. Trubner, 1913).

Bhattacharya, Jogendra Nath : *Hindu Castes and Sects* (Calcutta, Thacker Spink & Co., 1896).

Bloomfield Maurice : *The Religion of the Veda : The Ancient Religion of India* (New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908).

Blunt, E. A. H. : *The Caste System of Northern India : With Special reference to the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh* (London, Humphrey Nilford, 1931).

Burnouf : *L'Introduction a L'Histoire on Buddhisme Indien*.

- Bohtlingk : *Introduction to Bhagvat Gita* (Indian Antiquary, 1908. Supplement).
- Boudhayana : *Grihya Sutras*.
- Budhiraja, S. D. : *Bhagvat Gita*.
- Crawley : *Tree of Life*.
- Crawley & Tufts : *Evolution and Ethics*.
- Daftari, Keshao Laxman : *Dharmarahasya*.
- Date, Yashwant Ramkrishna : *Swadhyaya*, Magazine (1st Year, Double Number).
- Dewey, John : *Democracy and Education* (New York, Macmillan, 1916).
- Donald, A. Mackenzie : *Buddhism in Pre-Christian Britain* (London, Blackie & Son, 1928).
- Eggeling, Julius : *Satpatha Brahmana*—Part I to V (London Sacred Books of the East Series, Oxford 1885).
- Encyclopaedia Britannica : 11th Ed., Vol. XXVI.
- Fausboll, V. : *Indian Mythology*.
- Gait, Sir Edward : *Census of India Report* (1911.)
- Garbe, Richards : *Introduction to the Bhagvadgita*, Tr. by D. Mackichen, (Bombay, University of Bombay, 1918).
- Hamilton : *A New Account of the East Indies* (1744).
- Hazara : *Chronology of Puranas*.
- Hopkins, E. Washburn : *The Great Epic of India* (New York, Charles Scribner's Son, 1901).
- History of the Religion* (New York, the Macmillan Co., 1916).
- The Religions of India*.
- History of the Ruling Races*.
- Huxley, Tomas H. : *Evolution and Ethics* (London, Macmillan and Co. 1903).
- Ibbetson Denzil, *Punjab Census Report 1881* (Lahore, Govt. of Punjab 1881).
- Punjab Castes* (Lahore, Govt. of Punjab 1916).
- Innes, C. A. : *Gazetter of Malabar and Anjengo District* (Vol I).
- Jacks : *Morals and Religion* (Hibbert Journal Vol. XIX).
- Jacobi : *The dates of the Philosophical Sutras of the Brahmanas* (The Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. XXXI, 1911).
- Jaiswal : *Manu and Yajnavalkya*.
- Hindu Polity*.
- Kale, Tryambak Gurunath : *Purana Nirikshana* (Marathi) (Panvel).
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman : *A brief Sketch of the Purva Mimansa System* (Bombay 1924).
- *History of Dharma Shastra*.

- Kern H. : *Manual of Indian Buddhism* (Stransburg 1896).
- Kosambi, Dharmarand : *Hindi Sanskriti Ani Ahimsa* (Marathi) (Bombay, Author, 1935).
- Laski, Harold J. : *Liberty in the Modern State* (London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 1930).
- Laws, A. C. : *Natural Theology*.
- Lyall Sir Alfred : *Asiatic Studies—Religion and Society* (London, John Murray, 1907).
- Maine, Henry James : *Ancient Law* (London, J. M. Dent and Sons, 1861).
- Maritain Jacques : *The Conquest of Freedom* in 'Freedom—its Meaning' by Ruth Nanda Kishan).
- Max Muller : *Science and Religion* (Royal Institution, 1870) (London Longmans Green and Co., 1882).
- Lecture on the *Growth of Religion*, Hibbert Lectures 1878 (London, 1878);
- Mahaparinibbana Sutta*;
- Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, 1860.
- Medhatithi : *Commentary on Manu*, Edited by Vishwanath Narayan Mandlik (Bombay 1886).
- Mill, J. S. : *Utilitarianism and Liberty*, Representative Govt. (London 1954).
- Modern Review (July 1912).
- Moore, Edward : *Hindu Pantheon* (London, 1st Ed. by W. O. Simpson, 1810);
- *Hindu Infanticide* (London 1911).
- Muir : *White Yajurveda* (Original Sanskrit Texts, London, Trubner & Co., 57 & 59 Ludgate Hill, 1873 2nd Ed.)
- Nicolas, M.P. : *From Nietzsche down to Hitler* (London, William Hodge & Co., 1938).
- Nietzsche, F. W. : *Anti Christ*, Tr. from the German by H.L. Mencker (Torrance, The Noontide Press, 1880).
- THUS Spake Zarathustra* Translated by Thomas Common (New York, Macmillan Co 1905)
- Partigar : *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*.
- Plowman Max : *The Nemesis of Ineffectual Religion* (Adelphi 1941).
- Pratt : *Buddhism*.
- Pradnaneshwar Yati : *Chaturvarnya*;
- Upanayan*. Pringle Pattison : *Philosophy of Religion*.  
*Studies in Philosophy of Religion* (Oxford, Munro's Encyclopaedia of Education, 1930).
- Radhakrishnan, Sarvapalli : *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I and II (New York, Macmillan, 1923).

Rajwade, V. K. : *Article on Bhagvat Gita* (Bhandarkar Memorial Volume).

Rhys, Davids T. W. : *Buddhism*, Society for promoting Christain Knowledge (London, Northumberland Avenue W. C. 1886).

Ryakan Kimura : *A Historical Study of the Terms—Hinayana and Mahayana, and the Origin of Mahayana Buddhism* (Calcutta University 1927).

Sarkar, B. K. : *The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology*.

Satavalekar, M. D. : *Purushartha*, Vol. XIII.

Seal, Brajendranath : *The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus*.

Sen, Surendra Nath : *Early Career of Kanhoji Angria* and other papers.

Sham Shastri : *Memorial Volumes*.

—*Kautilya's Arthashastra*.

Shankaracharya : *Opposition to Krishnaism*.

Shastri, Harprasad : *Memorial Volume* (Ed. Narendra Nath Law, —*Buddhistic Studies*, Ed. B. C. Law).

Smith Robertson : *The Religion of the Semites* (1927.)

Smith, Vincent A : *Early History of India* (Oxford, 1924).

Stefens : *Commentary on the Law of England* (15th Ed. Vol. IV).

Taylor A. E. : *The Faith of a Moralist* Gifford Lectures, 1926-27 (London 1930).

Telang, K. T. : *Bhagvat Gita* (Ed. F Max Muller, Oxford, 1882).

Tilak, B. G. : *Gita Rahasya* (English Translation).

Travels of (1) Alberuni, (2) Duarte Barbosa, (3) Megasthenes.

Utgikar, N. B. : *Garbe's Introduction to the Bhagvat Gita* (Tr. from the German, Bombay 1918).

Vaidya, C. V. : *History of Medieval Hindu India*, in 3 vols. (Poona, 1921).

—*Riddle of the Ramayana*: Bombay, Radhabai Atmaram Sagoon, 1906).

Varthema, Ludovico Di : *Travels of* (Hakyt Society).

Vireswarananda Swami : *Brahma Sutras* (Advaita Ashram, 1936).

Weber Albrecht : *History of Indian Literature*, Tr. by John Mann and Theodor Zacharae (London, Kegan Paul, Trubner and Co. Ltd., 1878, 1892).

William Jackson, A. V. : *History of India* Vol. II (London 1906.)

Wilson : *Essays on Sanskrit Literature*, Vol. III.

Winternitz : *History of Indian Literature* (English Translation).

**Other Books** : Aitareya Brahmana, Nirukta, Narada Smriti, Mahabharata, Ramayana, Bhagvat Gita, Harivamsha, Yajnavalkya Smriti, Mitakshara. □ □

# INDEX

- Abhimanyu : 384  
 Acton, Lord : 66  
 Adams, D. S. : 8  
 Adhitthana : 449.  
 Adhvaryu : 253.  
 Adiparva : 171, 373-74, 393, 408.  
 Adityas : 413.  
 Afghans : 167, 236, 273.  
 Afghanistan : 230.  
 Agastya, Rishi : 52, 395, 413.  
 Ageres : 139.  
 Agnipavani : 159, 181.  
 Agni, God : 58, 161, 183, 395, 404.  
 Agnihotra : 258.  
 Agnihotri : 133, 234  
 Agni Purana : 256.  
 Agnyatavasa : 381, 382.  
 Ahalya : 394.  
 Ahimsa : 441, 450-51.  
 Ahirs : 104.  
 Aitareya Brahmana : 234.  
 Ajayadeva : 238.  
 Ajinkya (Draupadi's son) : 384.  
 Akshamala : 291.  
 Alberuni : 132, 134, 141.  
 Allauddin-Khilji : 232.  
 Altekar : 78, 79.  
 Amarkosh : 242, 252.  
 Ambalattika Pleasance : 195.  
 Ambarisha, King : 57-58, 404-05.  
 Ambattha : 204-20.  
 Ambattha Sutta : 204-20.  
 America : 453.  
 Amrosia : 403.  
 Ananda : 446, 452.  
 Anandpal : 231.  
 Anarchy : 460.  
 Anaryas (Non-Aryans) : 176, 267, 276.  
 Anathapindaka : 460.  
 Anatole France : 85.  
 Andhaka (Kingdom) : 385.  
 Andhras : 274-75.  
 Andhra Dynasty : 240, 244.  
 Anga King : 48, 63, 392, 426.  
 Angiras : 50, 56, 125, 216, 356, 393, 413.  
 Anguttara Nikaya : 187.  
 Anhilwad : 231.  
 Annam : 229.  
 Anti Christ : 75, 116.  
 Anrut Desh : 384.  
 Anu-Gita : 373.  
 Anuloma : 307-08, 319.  
 Anupataka : 83.  
 Anushasan Parva : 373, 410-411.  
 Apastamba-Dharma Sutra : 234, 356.  
 Apollo : 333.  
 Arabs : 236, 273.  
 Aranyakas : 246-47.  
 Arhat : 177, 204-05, 222-23, 225, 227.  
 Arians : 333.  
 Aristotle : 86, 333.  
 Arjuna : 62-63, 154, 169, 246, 262-65, 359, 361, 376-78, 382, 384, 386-90, 410-14, 472.  
 Arthashastra : 421, 424, 433-36.  
 Aryans : 150, 153-58, 165, 167-76, 186, 220-22, 231, 235, 251, 267, 276, 321-22, 418-28, 465.  
 Arya-Samajists : 78.  
 Aryavarta : 155, 169.  
 Asavas : 202, 448.  
 Ashoka, the Great : 237, 268, 423, 459.  
 Ashramas : 32, 34, 35.  
 Ashtanga Marg : 445.  
 Ashvalayana Grihya Sutra : 156, 172, 248.  
 Ashvalayana Kalpa Sutra : 234.  
 Ashvamedha Yajna : 157, 173, 269, 424.  
 Ashwatthama : 382-83.  
 Ashwins : 413, 418, 424.  
 Ashtadhyayi : 432.  
 Asia : 167.  
 Asita, Rishi : 307.  
 Assyria : 14.  
 Asuras : 51, 151-52, 154, 169, 176, 394, 409, 413, 418-19, 426.  
 Atharvan, Rishi : 125, 356.  
 Atharva Samhita : 234.  
 Atharva Veda : 253, 432.  
 Atheists : 303.  
 Atipataka : 83.  
 Ati Shudras : 7, 5, 25-26, 37, 107-08.  
 Atman : 85, 86.  
 Atri, Rishi : 48, 49, 292, 393, 413-14.  
 Atreyi (Race) : 392.  
 Aurva : 61, 408-09, 413.  
 Avabhritya : 191.  
 Avadan : 156, 172.

- Ayodhya : 57, 399, 404.  
 Ayonija : 156, 172.
- Babylonian : 16.  
 Bactria : 230.  
 Badarayan : 234, 247-49, 257, 259, 261, 363, 367, 378-79.  
 Badari, Rishi : 423.  
 Baines, J. A. : 335.  
 Baladitya : 240, 244-45.  
 Balakhilyas : 50.  
 Balaram : 384, 390.  
 Balfour : 77.  
 Ballava : 382.  
 Balperazim : 14.  
 Barbosa, Duarte : 134, 136.  
 Bana, the poet : 276.  
 Baneas, Merchants (Baniyas) : 102, 134, 135  
 Bartholomeu : 277.  
 Baudhayana : 79, 433.  
 Beard, Prof. : 96.  
 Bebel : 85.  
 Behar Sheriff : 237.  
 Belvalkar, Prof. : 257.  
 Benaras : 233, 401, 409, 422.  
 Bengal : 231, 237, 243, 252, 295.  
 Beowulf : 85.  
 Bergson, Prof. : 25, 321.  
 Betunes, Merchants : 140.  
 Bhagadatta : 385  
 Bhagvat Gita : 78, 80, 81, 127-28, 150, 239-40, 244-46, 257, 261-65, 357-80, 468, 472.  
 Bhagvat Purana : 248, 256.  
 Bhagvat, Rajaram Shashtri : 246.  
 Bhakti Marg : 264, 360, 376, 472.  
 Bhandarkar, Sir R. G. : 231, 235.  
 Bhangis : 103.  
 Bharata, King : 128, 264.  
 Bhargava Rishi : 408-09.  
 Bhatias : 65.  
 Bhattacharya, Mr. : 142.  
 Bhavishya Purana : 253, 256.  
 Bhesika, the Barber : 223.  
 Bhikkuni Sangha : 452.  
 Bhikkus : 232-35, 242, 251, 309-10, 322, 446, 452-53  
 Bhima : 388.  
 Bhishma : 157, 173, 307, 377, 381-83, 385-90.  
 Bhishma Parva : 261.  
 Bhu-Devas : 325, 328.  
 Bhrigu Rishi : 57, 60-61, 63, 216, 270, 292, 329, 404, 408-09.  
 Biabares : 138.  
 Bible : 15, 75, 116, 357, 360.  
 Bihar : 232-33, 267.  
 Bimbisar, the King : 195, 267.  
 Bismark : 331.  
 Blake, Mr. : 87.  
 Black Yagush : 234.  
 Bloomfield, Prof. : 266.  
 Blunt, Mr. : 102-03, 105.  
 Bodhisatta : 188.  
 Bodhi Tree : 237.  
 Bohtlingk Mr. : 357.  
 Bolshevism : 128.  
 Bombay : 146, 234, 243, 252, 324.  
 Bonda Porajas : 89.  
 Borgese Pope : 325.  
 Boudhayana : 79, 356.  
 Brahanaradiya : 256.  
 Brahannada : 382.  
 Brahaspati : 51-52, 154, 169, 294-95, 394-95.  
 Brahma : 28, 33, 50, 52, 54-55, 58-59, 85-86, 108, 123, 155, 171, 191, 255, 272, 278, 280, 337, 348, 351, 358, 386, 395-96, 398, 404, 419, 427.  
 Brahmacharya : 101, 123, 432.  
 Brahmadatta : 176-77.  
 Brahma Jal Sutta : 176.  
 Brahmanas (Texts) : 246-47, 395-96.  
 Brahma-Purana : 256.  
 Brahma Nirvana : 369.  
 Brahmanda-Purana : 253, 256.  
 Brahma-Sutra Bhashya : 240, 245, 247, 257.  
 Brahma Sutras : 363, 367, 375.  
 Brahma Vaivarta Purana : 256.  
 Brahminism : 150, 154, 220, 230, 232-40, 266-71, 273-75, 277, 280, 282, 285-95, 301, 304, 306-08, 313-17, 320-24, 326-28, 368, 431, 465.  
 Brahmins : 7, 25-28, 30-32, 36-43, 45-56, 59-65, 68-83, 99-102, 104-10, 112-13, 118-24, 127, 132-33, 135-36, 139-41, 147, 150, 154-55, 158-63, 166-69, 173-76, 179-85, 189-223, 225-28, 231, 233-38, 242, 246, 248, 251, 255-57, 261, 263-64, 266, 268-69, 272-86, 289-91, 303-13, 316-20, 322-31, 335-56, 363, 378-79, 381, 392-93, 396-98, 400, 403, 408-15, 416-18, 421-25, 431, 435, 445, 467-69  
 Addicted to:  
 (a) Adorning : 160, 181.  
 (b) Couches : 159, 181.  
 (c) Earning by wrong means : 160-64, 182-86.  
 (d) Low conversation : 160, 181.  
 (e) Recreation : 169, 180.  
 (f) Visiting shows : 158, 180.  
 (g) Wrangling phrases : 160, 182.

- Course of Conduct : 281.  
 Dakshina to : 282-83.  
 Disabilities : 280-81.  
 Exemption of :  
     Punishments : 118-19, 279.  
     Monopolies : 278.  
     Penances : 284.  
     Privileges : 119, 279.  
 Rights of :  
     To Fees : 282-83.  
     To Rebellion : 276-77.  
 Tax : 278.  
 Status—Above Law : 118.  
 Supremacy of : 72, 76-77, 117-18.  
 Briex (Author) : 85.  
 Britain : 167.  
 Buddha Lord : 152, 153, 165-68, 176-78, 182-88, 195-96, 200-30, 233, 322-23, 325, 328, 363, 367-68, 371, 379, 441-42, 444-53, 459-61.  
 Buddha Gaya : 237.  
 Buddhism : 149-50, 153, 167, 186-87, 227-38, 239, 244, 249, 251, 257, 266-67, 269-75, 290-91, 294-95, 303, 309-10, 315-17, 323, 335, 363-71, 379, 432, 460-61, 466, 470-72.  
 Buddhists : 152, 167, 171, 175, 187, 230-31, 233-38, 242, 251, 257, 268-75, 291, 309-10, 313, 315-16, 322, 336, 368-69, 374, 376, 380.  
 Buddhist Church (*See* Sangha).  
 Buddhist Councils : 379.  
 Buddhist Literature : 248, 252.  
 Buddhist Monasteries : 232.  
 Buddhist Universities : 232.  
 Buddhi Yoga : 362.  
 Buddhology : 379-80.  
 Bundelkhand : 231.  
 Burke Edmund : 453.  
 Burma : 229.  
  
 Calicut : 136.  
 Cambridge : 335.  
 Canaques : 139.  
 Carlyle : 462.  
 Carthaginians : 14.  
 Caste : 45-46, 49, 68, 80, 102-06, 141-43, 145-47, 266, 275, 285-86, 289-90, 295-301, 303-08, 318, 326, 334-36, 368, 420-22.  
 Caste-System : 25-26, 37-38, 45, 67-68, 102, 147, 204, 220.  
 Causation, law of : 442, 446.  
 Celestial wheel : 454-56.  
 Ceylon : 229.  
 Chachnama : 236.  
 Chaitya : 242, 251-52.  
 Chaldeans : 16.  
 Chalukyas : 231.  
 Chandāla : 37, 55-56, 114, 133, 170, 402-03.  
 Chandragupta Maurya : 130, 268, 372-73.  
 Charvaka : 368.  
 Chaturvarṇya : 67, 69-71, 80-81, 277, 291, 321-22, 326-28, 356, 361-65, 386, 426, 466.  
 Chauhans : 231.  
 Chawdas : 231.  
 Chedi : 231.  
 Chemosh : 14-15.  
 Chenchus (a tribe) : 89.  
 Chhandogya Upanishad : 423.  
 China : 229.  
 Chinese-Turkistan : 229.  
 Chitpavan Brahmin : 65.  
 Chitransen : 382.  
 Cholas : 231.  
 Christ, Jesus : 97.  
 Christians : 76, 100, 128, 303-04, 335.  
 Christians, Roman Catholics : 32.  
 Christianity : 7, 75-76, 116-17, 142, 304, 335, 357, 460, 470.  
 Church : 136.  
 Church Discipline Act : 290.  
 Church of England : 290.  
 Chyavana Rishi : 413-14, 424.  
 Civil Liberty : 98.  
 Civil Theology : 5.  
 Class Conflict : 444.  
 Class-System : 305-06.  
 Class-war : 64.  
 Commandments : 18.  
 Communism : 443-44, 447, 450, 460-62, 471.  
 Communists : 450-52, 459-60.  
 Comte : 86.  
 Coomarswami, A. K. : 300.  
 Constantine : 303.  
 Copernican Revolution : 9.  
 Crawley, Prof. : 11, 24, 82.  
 Cretaus : 333.  
 Criminal Tribes : 90, 92.  
 Cuiavem Caste : 138.  
  
 Dahir the King : 231, 236.  
 Daityas : 413, 419.  
 Daksha Prajapati : 155, 171, 419.  
 Dalmu : 103.  
 Dam : 157, 173.  
 Damayanti : 154, 168.  
 Danavas : 413, 419.  
 Daphtary, K. L. : 286 (Fn).  
 Darshanas, Six : 86.  
 Darādas (Region) : 63.

- Darwin : 9.  
*Das Capital* : 444.  
 Dasyus : 176, 419-21.  
 Date, Y. R. : 82(Fn).  
 Dattatreya : 61, 411.  
 Dauhitra : 155, 171.  
 David : 14.  
 Deccan : 209, 231.  
 Democracy : 128, 459.  
 Demon-Mada : 414.  
 Deshastha Brahman : 65.  
 Devas : 151-52, 156-57, 172, 189-90, 413-14.  
 Devadatta : 28, 109, 167, 351.  
 Devagiri : 232.  
 Devayani : 291, 307.  
 Devodas : 422.  
 Dewey, Prof. John : 306, 451.  
 Dhahaprachetani : 155, 171.  
 Dhamma : 166, 226, 371, 445, 447, 449, 452, 461.  
 Dhammapada : 360.  
 Dharmaraj : 82, 154, 168-69, 171, 375.  
 Dharma Shastra : 78-79.  
 Dhar State : 231.  
 Dhivaras : 49, 393.  
 Dhritarashtra : 246, 261-62, 385-90.  
 Dhyana : 235.  
 Dibbasota : 213.  
 Dibbakakkhu (Divyachakshu) : 213, 389.  
 Dictatorship : 451-53, 459, 461, 471.  
 Diodorus Siculus : 333.  
 Diti : 419.  
 Dirghatapa : 156.  
 Dnanakanda : 247-48.  
 Dnyanyog : 472.  
 Dnyana Marga : 264, 360, 362.  
 Domba : 133.  
 Donald, Dr. : 167.  
 Draupadi : 154, 156, 169, 172, 382, 384, 388-89.  
 Dridhanetra : 55.  
 Drona : 381-83, 387, 389-90, 377.  
 Dronaparvan : 63.  
 Drupad : 384-85.  
 Durmukha : 382.  
 Duryodhana : 263, 375, 381-91.  
 Dushala (Warrior) : 382.  
 Dushasana : 381-82, 389.  
 Dushtadyumna (Draupadi's son) : 384.  
 Dutta, R. C. : 68.  
 Dwarka : 384-85.  
  
 Edom : 15, 16.  
 Edomites : 16.  
 Edukas : 251-52, 374.  
 Eggeling : 330.  
  
 Egypt : 128.  
 Egyptian : 321, 333.  
 Europe : 70.  
 Europeans : 147, 304.  
 Equality, Philosophy of : 25, 37.  
 Ezekiel : 99.  
  
 Farahabad : 89.  
 Fatikpur : 102.  
 Feudalism : 128.  
 Fraternity, Philosophy of : 44, 46.  
 French : 95, 153.  
 French Court : 25.  
 French Revolution : 21 462.  
  
 Gadhi, King : 54, 62, 396-97, 409.  
 Gait, Sir Edward : 335.  
 Galava, Rishi : 156, 172.  
 Ganesh : 255, 400.  
 Gana : 151.  
 Gandhar : 230.  
 Gandhari : 387, 389.  
 Gandharvas : 50, 151, 418.  
 Gandhi M. K. : 124.  
 Ganga : 232, 291, 307, 403.  
 Garbe, Prof. Richards : 240, 244-46 357-58, 366, 376.  
 Gargi : 259, 432.  
 Garuda : 256.  
 Gautama, Smriti : 43, 79, 122, 396.  
 Gautam Utathya : 292.  
 Gayatri Mantra : 32, 33, 62, 234, 348-49.  
 Ghorī Mohammad : 231.  
 Ghorī Shahabuddin : 231.  
 Giddings : 85.  
 Gita Rahasya : 244, 360.  
 Goraksya : 127.  
 Gotam, the Buddha : *see* Buddha  
 Government—  
     Parliamentary : 452.  
     By force : 453.  
     By Moral Disposition : 453.  
 Graded Inequality : 320, 326.  
 Grahasthashram : 123.  
 Granthik (Nakul) : 328.  
 Greek : 5, 15, 97, 130.  
 Greece : 15, 128.  
 Grihya Sutras : 248, 373, 433.  
 Grimm's Fairy Tale : 148.  
 Gujars : 104.  
 Gujarat : 134, 233, 238.  
 Gulohits : 231.  
 Gupta, kings : 237, 378.  
 Gupta Dynasty : 240, 244-45.  
 Gurukul : 432.



- Haeckel : 85-86.  
 Hadi (People) : 133.  
 Haihaya Kshatriyas : 408-12,  
 Hamilton : 324.  
 Hardayal, Lala : 85.  
 Havishyanda : 55.  
 Harishchandra : 400-03.  
 Harivamsa : 57, 171, 392, 399.  
 Harrisor, Frederic : 85.  
 Harsha : 237.  
 Hastinapur : 388.  
 Hazara Mr. : 255.  
 Hebraism : 33.5  
 Herbert Spencer : 23.  
 Hermes : 333.  
 Hestia Goddess : 333.  
 Himalayas : 51, 59, 61, 207, 394, 397, 408.  
 Himachal Pradesh : 151.  
 Hinayan Buddhism : 371, 379.  
 Hindi : 233.  
 Hindu Religion : *see* Hinduism  
 Hindus : 7, 8, 22-24, 31, 32, 37-38, 42, 48,  
 64-68, 70, 74-75, 78-84, 86, 90, 92, 95,  
 100-107, 110-20, 123-24, 127-30, 132-34,  
 141-48, 152, 157, 165, 172, 229-30, 236,  
 239, 244, 255, 270, 273-74, 285, 299, 305,  
 308, 314, 316, 320-23, 326, 328-29, 332,  
 336-37, 357, 366, 369, 392, 430, 469,  
 471.  
 Hinduism : 3, 5, 7, 8, 22, 24, 31, 34, 36-38,  
 42-44, 39-41, 46, 64-67, 71-72, 74, 77-82,  
 84, 86-87, 92, 132, 141-44, 231, 234,  
 236-38, 242-44, 270, 274, 305, 334-36,  
 357, 468, 470.  
 (a) Equality in : 25-37.  
 (b) Ethics in : 71-87.  
 (c) Fraternity in : 44-66.  
 (d) Liberty in : 38-44.  
 (e) Utility of : 66-71.  
 Hiranvati river : 391.  
 Hiranyakashyapu : 426.  
 Hitler, Adolf : 75, 322.  
 Hobbes : 279.  
 Hollius : 90.  
 Holy Trinity : 136.  
 Hopkins Prof. : 167, 241, 244-46, 252, 253,  
 331, 357, 372-73.  
 Holtzman : 358.  
 Hoyasalas : 232.  
 Huen Tsang : 231.  
 Huns : 237, 242, 251.  
 Humboldt : 246.  
 Huxley, Edward : 85.  
 Ibbetson, Sir Denzil : 142, 335.  
 Ibne Kasim : 231, 243, 252.  
 Iddhi : 213.  
 Ikkanhankala wood : 204-05, 218.  
 Ikshwaku : 57, 396, 398, 405, 410.  
 Ila : 50, 155, 171, 393.  
 India : 7, 70, 85-86, 102, 104-05 (fn.), 145,  
 151, 229, 231, 232, 236-38, 266-67, 270,  
 273, 275, 308-09, 323-26, 335, 363, 372,  
 420.  
 Indo-China : 229-30.  
 Indra : 50-52, 56-59, 63, 176, 393-95,  
 404-05, 413-14, 419-20, 424, 427.  
 Indraprastha : 385-86.  
 Indrani : 50-51, 394-96.  
 Inter-dining : 204, 292-93, 301, 304, 307,  
 327.  
 Inter-marriage : 204, 292-93, 301, 304, 306,  
 327.  
 Islam : 7, 142, 229-30, 233, 236, 274, 335,  
 470.  
 Israel : 14, 17.  
 Israelites : 128.  
 Jacob : 16.  
 Jacobi, Prof. : 378.  
 Jacks, Prof. : 333, 34.  
 Jaimini : 234, 241, 247, 250, 257-59, 261,  
 334, 362-67, 378-80, 423.  
 Jainism : 238, 275, 335, 451, 470.  
 Jaiswala : 102-03.  
 Jamadagni : 62-63, 389, 410, 412.  
 Janaka-King : 258-59, 432.  
 Janapada : 421.  
 Janasruti : 423.  
 Janhavi : 155, 171.  
 Japan : 229.  
 Jaratkari : 291, 307  
 Jaratkaru : 291, 307.  
 Jataka : 132.  
 Jatibhramsakara : 83.  
 Jaya : 248 50, 378.  
 Jayapala : 231.  
 Jehovah : 14, 17, 99.  
 Jeremiah : 15.  
 Jewish : 75, 116.  
 Jews : 97, 127, 333.  
 Judaism : 7.  
 Kadheras : 103.  
 Kaharas : 104.  
 Kakatiyas : 232.  
 Kalachuris : 231.

- Kalanjas (Tribes) : 419.  
 Kaleyayas (Tribes) : 419.  
 Kali Goddess : 90  
 Kalinga : 63.  
 Kalins (Tribes) : 419.  
 Kalluk Bhatta : 272.  
 Kalmashpad (King) : 405.  
 Kalpa Shudhi : 254.  
 Kalpa Sutras : 247.  
 Kam : 157, 173.  
 Kanada Muni : 234.  
 Kanauij : 231.  
 Kandalas : 158.  
 Kandala Vamsa Dhopanām : 158, 180.  
 Kandarpa : 59.  
 Kane Memorial Lecture : 78, 248.  
 Kane P. V. : 248, 294, 295, 307, 323,  
 Kanha : 208, 210.  
 Kanhayanas : 208, 209.  
 Kanhoji Angria : 236.  
 Kanishka King : 379.  
 Kank (Sahadev) : 153, 168, 382.  
 Kanvas (People) : 274-75.  
 Kanyakubja : 62.  
 Kapilvastu : 165, 207.  
 Karhada Brahmins : 65.  
 Karl Marx : 86, 104, 170, 329, 441, 443-46,  
 450, 471.  
 Karmakand : 247-48, 257, 259, 261.  
 Karma Marg : 360, 362-63, 366.  
 Karma Purana : 256.  
 Karmayoga : 264, 472.  
 Karna : 381 83, 385, 387, 390.  
 Karsandas Mulji : 324.  
 Kartavirya, King : 60-61, 63, 329, 408, 410,  
 413.  
 Karuna : 370.  
 Kashiraj King : 384.  
 Kashmir : 63, 237.  
 Kasi : 224.  
 Kashyapa : 63, 155, 171, 253, 419.  
 Kassapa : 216.  
 Katak, Commentator : 243.  
 Katch (Son of Brahmaspati) : 154, 169.  
 Katyayana Smriti : 43.  
 Katyayana : 311.  
 Katyayana Srauta Sutra-423.  
 Kauravas : 241, 246, 250, 261-63, 381-89.  
 Kausika King : 399, 406, 407, 410.  
 Kaushiki-River : 59.  
 Kausitaki Grihya Sutra : 154, 169.  
 Kausitaki (Vratya) : 426,  
 Kautilya : 154, 169, 421, 424, 433-34,  
 436-37.  
 Kayasthas : 45, 104.  
 Keith, Prof. : 249.  
 Kern, Mr. : 371-72.  
 Ketkar S. V. : 300.  
 Khandvavana : 63.  
 Khanumata : 195-96.  
 Khanti : 449.  
 Khatika : 102.  
 Kichaka : 154, 169, 381.  
 Kimura Mr. : 379.  
 Kings Court : 25.  
 Kinnars : 151, 418.  
 Konkan : 232.  
 Koran : 360.  
 Koris : 103.  
 Kosala : 167, 175, 204, 216, 222, 224, 445.  
 Kosambi, Dharmanand : 240, 242, 244,  
 251-52.  
 Kripacharya : 381-83.  
 Krishna : 80, 127-28, 150, 154, 169, 176,  
 246, 262-64, 358-59, 364-65, 369-71,  
 373-78, 384-91, 468, 470-72.  
 Krishna Dwaipayana : 307.  
 Krishna Vasudeo : 378.  
 Kritisayuga : 192-93.  
 Kshatriyas : 25-27, 30-32, 37-39, 48, 53, 54,  
 56, 60-64, 69-71, 80, 99-104, 106-13,  
 119-22, 125, 127, 132, 142, 147, 150,  
 154-55, 169-70, 174, 182, 197-201, 210-  
 12, 221, 231, 253, 276-81, 286, 291-92,  
 295, 307, 310-13, 317-20, 325-31, 338-41,  
 346, 348, 351, 353, 356, 364, 377, 389,  
 392-93, 396-401, 408-18, 421-24, 435.  
 Kudaldeshkar Brahmin : 65.  
 Kumarila Bhatt : 79, 155, 169.  
 Kunti : 157, 173, 388-90.  
 Kurma Purana : 256.  
 Kurukshetra : 390.  
 Kusa King : 53.  
 Kushan Tribe : 236.  
 Kusanabha (Prajapati's son) : 53, 396.  
 Kusinara : 166.  
 Kutadanta : 195-96, 200, 202-05.  
 Kuvera : 52, 263, 395.  
 Lacedaemonians : 333.  
 Laja Hoame : 156, 172.  
 Laski, Harold H. : 38 (fn).  
 Law, Narendra nath : 235 (fn)  
 Liberty, Philosophy of : 38, 44.  
 Lenin : 461.  
 Linga Purana : 256.  
 Lohikka Brahmin : 222-228.  
 Lokayat : 205.  
 London : 167.  
 Lucknow : 102.  
 Ludovico Di Varthema : 324.  
 Lykurgus : 333.  
 Lyall, Sir Alfred : 335-36,

- Mackenzie : 167.  
 Madhava Rao, Sir T. : 165.  
 Madhavi : 155-56, 172.  
 Maddarupi (Okkaka's daughter) : 209, 210.  
 Madhvacharya : 248-49.  
 Madhusyanda : 55, 58, 404.  
 Madhyandin Brahmins : 233.  
 Madura : 232.  
 Magadha : 37, 195, 267-68, 425.  
 Mahabharata : 50, 61, 63, 151, 154, 169, 173, 234, 239-44, 249-53, 257, 261, 372-75, 393, 405-06, 408, 410, 421-22, 472.  
 Maha Bhashya : 432.  
 Mahabharat-Adiparva : 50.  
 Mahabhiras : 103.  
 Mahananda : 268.  
 Mahapadan Sutta : 370.  
 Mahapari Nibbana : 451.  
 Mahapari Nibbana Sutta : 369.  
 Mahapataka : 83.  
 Mahaprajapati Gotami : 452.  
 Mahasangikas : 379.  
 Mahavir : 451.  
 Mahayan Buddhism : 371-72, 379-80.  
 Maheshwar Bhattacharya : 242, 252.  
 Maheshwar, the God : 300.  
 Mahishmati : 61.  
 Mains, Sir Henry : 333.  
 Maitrei : 432.  
 Maitri : 370.  
 Majhima Nikaya : 370.  
 Makatyam System : 325.  
 Malabar : 138, 140-41, 187, 324-25.  
 Malachi : 15.  
 Malava : 63.  
 Malaya : 229.  
 Manava Artha Shastra : 271.  
 Manava Dharma Sutra : 271.  
 Manava Dharma Shastra : 332.  
 Manava Grihya Sutra : 271.  
 Manikpura : 102-03.  
 Manu : 25-31, 34-43, 48, 53, 67, 70-79, 81, 87, 108-18, 121-26, 221, 240, 249, 254, 266, 270-73, 277-95, 301-03, 308-19, 324-32, 334-45, 347-56, 414, 416, 421-25, 429, 437.  
 Manu on :  
 (a) Gradation : 72-73, 113, 337-38.  
 (b) Hospitality : 345.  
 (c) Injunctions : 121-22.  
 (d) Marriage : 317.  
 (e) Naming ceremony : 38.  
 (f) Occupation : 111, 338.  
 (g) Offences—  
 (1) Abuse : 28, 109, 318, 351.  
 (2) Adultery : 29, 109-10, 352.  
 (3) Arrogance : 29, 109, 352.  
 (4) Assault : 29, 109, 352.  
 (5) Defamation : 28, 108-09, 318, 351.  
 (6) False Evidence : 28, 351.  
 (7) Punishments : 30.  
 (h) Privileges re :  
 (1) Finance : 342.  
 (2) Marriages : 339.  
 (3) Occupation : 111-12, 339-42.  
 (i) Sacred Thread : 32-33, 100-01, 347  
 (j) Salutations : 27, 346.  
 (k) Shudras and Women : 347-50.  
 (l) Social Intercourse : 344-47.  
 (m) Social Status : 114, 122, 345-46.  
 (n) Vratyas : 350.  
 Manu Smriti (Laws of Manu) : 70, 76, 78, 80-81, 87, 107, 239-40, 244, 108-18, 121-26, 150, 270-73, 276-84, 288, 291, 303, 311, 314, 317, 326, 332-38, 414, 467, 469, 471.  
 Manu Vaivasvata : 393.  
 Manorama (Sister of Uttar) : 382.  
 Manvantara : 254, 287.  
 Mara : 204, 222.  
 Maratha Rule : 64, 79.  
 Marathas : 65, 233.  
 Marichi Rishi : 48, 393.  
 Marisha (Soma's daughter) : 155, 171.  
 Maritain Jacques : 95.  
 Markandeya Puran : 400.  
 Marshal : 85.  
 Maru : 155, 171.  
 Marxian Creed : 444.  
 Marxian Socialism : 443.  
 Marxism : 48.  
 Mathura : 155.  
 Matru Savarnya : 308.  
 Matsyagandha : 157, 173, 291, 307.  
 Matsya Purana : 256.  
 Mauryas : 268, 270-71, 274-75, 277, 412.  
 Maurya Empire : 71.  
 Max Muller, Prof. : 7, 86, 233, 333, 336, 359.  
 Maya : 358.  
 Mazdaism : 335.  
 Medhatithi : 270.  
 Megasthenes : 130, 141, 371, 373, 378.  
 Meru : 406.  
 Menaka (Apsara) : 58, 291, 307.  
 Menvis : 333.  
 Metta : 449.  
 Mevad : 231.  
 Mihirkula : 237.  
 Mills, J. S. : 25, 44, 64, 66, 246-47, 259, 432.  
 Minos : 333.  
 Mitakshara : 294.  
 Mlenezhas : 242.  
 Moab : 14, 15.

- Mohd. ,Gazni : 243, 252, 270.  
 Mohd. ,Ghori : 243, 252, 374.  
 Momjack Nagar : 89.  
 Mongols : 273.  
 Monks (Buddhist) : *see* Bhikkus.  
 Moors : 102, 134-35, 140.  
 Morad : 14.  
 Moral Equality : 97.  
 Morality : 12, 442.  
 Morias : 89.  
 Moses : 333.  
 Mudita : 370.  
 Muslims : 100, 126, 129, 134, 142, 229-30, 232, 242, 251-52, 273-75, 304, 335, 374.  
 Muslim Invasion : 229-32, 236, 238, 242-43, 251-52.  
 Mussolini : 322.  
 Mythical Theology : 5.  
  
 Nagas : 267-68, 307, 419, 465.  
 Nahusha (king) : 50-52, 170, 172, 329, 393-95.  
 Nakula : 388.  
 Nalanda : 232.  
 Namadheya : 122.  
 Namboodri Brahmins : 324.  
 Nanda (cowherd) : 221.  
 Nanda, the king : 268, 422-23.  
 Naomi : 17.  
 Napoleon : 330.  
 Narada : 26, 389.  
 Narada Smriti : 107, 270.  
 Nayadis : 92.  
 Nayar : 137-40.  
 Nazis : 75, 126-27.  
 Nazism : 74-75, 128.  
 Nekkhamma : 449.  
 Nepal : 237.  
 Nietzsche, F. W. : 67, 74-77, 116-17, 123-24, 321.  
 Nighantu : 234.  
 Nimbarkacharya : 248-49.  
 Nimi, the king : 52-53, 329, 396, 413.  
 Nirvana : 369, 445-46, 448.  
 Nirukta : 234, 419.  
 Nishada : 49-56, 393, 418, 426, 428.  
 Noble Eight-Fold Path : 447-49.  
 Non-Aryan : 307, 418, 420-21, 425-26.  
 Non-Brahmins : 65, 146, 255, 266, 277, 281, 290, 304.  
 Non-Communists : 450.  
 Nurbada River : 231.  
 Nun (Buddhist) : 310.  
  
 Okkaka, the King : 207-10.  
 Okkamukh : 207.  
 Old Testament : 14, 17.  
 Oscar Wilde : 71, 285.  
 Out Cast : 301-04.  
  
 Pahalawas : 54, 397.  
 Pajavan : 422.  
 Paila (Vyasa's pupil) : 241, 250.  
 Pal Dynasty : 231.  
 Palestine : 15.  
 Panchamas : 99.  
 Panchashila 186, 447.  
 Panchatantra : 248.  
 Panchapriya caste : 103.  
 Pandavas : 154, 168, 241, 250, 261-62, 381-91, 421.  
 Pandu : 157, 173, 243, 253, 261-62, 273.  
 Panini : 37, 234, 273, 432.  
 Panna : 449.  
 Paramitas : 449-50.  
 Parashar Rishi : 156-57, 170-73, 291, 307.  
 Paravasu : 412.  
 Parmars : 231.  
 Parahurama : 62-64, 170, 328, 330, 409-10, 412.  
 Parthia : 230.  
 Pasenadi king : 175, 204, 216, 222, 224-25, 445.  
 Pataliputra : 237, 337, 379.  
 Patanjali : 432.  
 Paul St. : 97, 100.  
 Paulomas : 419.  
 Paura : 421.  
 Persia : 128.  
 Persians : 321, 336.  
 Peshawar : 48.  
 Peter : 325.  
 Philip of Macedon : 14.  
 Philistines : 14.  
 Philo-Bablias : 16.  
 Philosophy of Hinduism :  
     (a) Equality : 25-37  
     (b) Ethics : 71-87.  
     (c) Fraternity : 44-66.  
     (d) Liberty : 38-44.  
     (e) Utility : 66-71.  
 Phoenician : 16.  
 Pig Philosophy : 462.  
 Pilgrim Fathers : 97, 100.  
 Pishachas : 419.  
 Pitra Savarnya : 308.  
 Plato : 4-5, 40, 86, 321-22.  
 Plowman, Max : 86  
 Pokkharasadi : 204-6, 215-220.

Ochler, Richard : 75.  
 Odantapuri : 232.

- Poleas : 140-41.  
 Portuguese : 134, 141.  
 Potthapada Brahmin : 444-46.  
 Prahlad : 426.  
 Prajapati : 49, 53, 57, 71, 106, 152, 392-93, 396.  
 Prajnaneswar Yati : 286, 289.  
 Pratihars : 231.  
 Pratiloma : 307-08.  
 Prayashchitta : 143.  
 Pritha, the king : 264.  
 Pringle-Pattison : 3, 5.  
 Prithvi Raj : 231.  
 Proletariat—  
     Dictatorship of : 444, 450.  
 Pulamas : 242, 244, 251.  
 Punarbhu : 294.  
 Punarbhava : 295.  
 Punjab : 45, 102, 142, 231, 237.  
 Punna (slave girl) : 221.  
 Punnika (slave girl) : 221.  
 Puranas : 48, 166, 239, 242, 244, 251, 253-57, 355, 373, 375.  
 Pururavas : 50, 170, 329, 393.  
 Purusha Sukta : 80.  
 Purva Mimansa Sutra : 79, 247, 262, 265, 267, 423.  
 Pushkara : 58.  
 Pushyamitra-Sunga : 239-40, 244, 257, 268-69, 271-73, 275-77, 291, 295.  
  
 Rabbinitism : 116.  
 Radhakrishnan Dr. S. : 369.  
 Rajputs : 105, 134, 231, 236, 238.  
 Rajasuya Yajna : 375.  
 Rajawade V. K. : 246.  
 Rakshasas : 405-8, 419.  
 Rambha (Apsara) : 59.  
 Ramanujacharya : 248.  
 Rama : 383, 468 470  
 Ramayana : 21, 39, 43-44, 53-54, 57, 396.  
 Ratnis : 421, 432.  
 Ravana : 243, 252.  
 Renuka : 410.  
 Rhys Davids : 220, 222, 369.  
 Richika : 57, 62-63, 404, 409.  
 Rig Veda : 82, 234, 277, 420, 422-23, 426.  
 Robertson : 6.  
 Rohit : 403.  
 Roma : 128, 243.  
 Romaharshana : 253.  
 Roman Conquerors : 97.  
 Rousseau : 86.  
 Rudra : 51, 263, 394, 419, 427.  
 Rukmi : 390.  
 Ruskin : 86.  
 Russia : 444, 447, 461.  
  
 Russian-Revolution : 21, 462  
 Ruth : 17.  
  
 Sabbath : 11.  
 Sabuktagin : 231.  
 Sachi (Indrani) : 396.  
 Sadharana Dharma : 334.  
 Sahadeo : 388.  
 Sahyadrikhand : 48, 106.  
 Sairandhri : 154, 169.  
 Sakya : 165, 204-09, 222, 451  
 Sakya's Congress Hall : 207.  
 Salavatika : 222-25.  
 Samana Phala Sutta : 204, 212, 227.  
 Sama Veda : 234, 248, 277, 426.  
 Samavedi Brahmins : 268.  
 Sambandham Unions : 325.  
 Sambhar (State) : 231.  
 Samorin : 324.  
 Samudra Gupta, king : 269.  
 Sanatkumar : 50, 393, 424.  
 Sanat Sujata : 386.  
 Sangha : 371, 446, 452, 461.  
 Sanjaya : 246-47, 262, 385-87, 390.  
 Sankhya : 264, 364, 370, 377-78.  
 Sankhyayog : 472.  
 Samskaras : 107, 315.  
 Sanskrit : 346.  
 Santa Maria : 136.  
 Sanyas : 107, 123, 221,  
 Sanyasashram : 261.  
 Saptapadi : 157, 172.  
 Sapta Rishi (Saptasrshi) : 87, 286.  
 Saraswat Brahmin : 45, 50, 65, 102.  
 Sarasvati : 406-08.  
 Sariputta : 449.  
 Sarkar B. K. : 323.  
 Sasanka, king : 327.  
 Satadru : 406.  
 Satavalekar M. D. : 419.  
 Sati : 221, 294-95.  
 Satpatha Brahmana : 152, 331, 423.  
 Satyaki : 384-85, 388-89.  
 Satyavati : 62, 156, 171, 409-10.  
 Satyavrata : 398-400.  
 Saurasenitis : 373.  
 Sauti : 241, 250, 372, 379.  
 Saunaka : 292.  
 Saviya (Taramati) : 400-01.  
 Sayanacharya : 426.  
 Seal, Dr. Brajandra Nath : 323.  
 Seleukos Nickator : 130.  
 Semites : 15.  
 Sena Kings : 231.  
 Sen G. P. : 336.  
 Sen Surendra Nath : 236.  
 Sermon on the Mount : 460.

- Shakas : 54, 397.  
 Shaka Era. : 372, 374.  
 Shakuni : 382, 384.  
 Shakuntala : 307.  
 Shalya : 385.  
 Shalya Parva : 406.  
 Shami tree : 382.  
 Shankaracharya : 239-40, 244-45, 248-49.  
     360, 432.  
 Shankara, God : 263.  
 Shantarakshit : 240, 245.  
 Shantanu : 157, 173, 291, 307.  
 Shantiparva : 373, 422.  
 Sharmistha : 291, 307.  
 Shastri, Dr. Harprasad : 235, 269, 425.  
 Shatanik (Virat's Brother) : 381.  
 Shatrupa : 155, 171.  
 Sheelas : 187, 212-13, 447.  
 Shikhandi (Draupadi's son) : 384.  
 Shishupal : 375.  
 Shiva : 54, 237, 255, 335, 398, 401, 468, 470.  
 Shrauta Sutra : 432.  
 Shrotriya : 158, 234.  
 Shrutis : 78-79, 114.  
 Shudras :  
     Before Manu : 418, 428.  
     Duties of : 112, 312, 418.  
     Ideal of life for-39-40.  
     Not to be :  
         Judge-417.  
         Respected-416.  
 Prohibition to :  
     (a) Marriage-416.  
     (b) Sacraments-33-35.  
     (c) Vedas-42, 311, 417.  
     (d) Wealth-40, 41, 74, 311-12,  
     Punishments for-417.  
     Servile name of-38, 418.  
     Servile Status of-74, 121, 418.  
 Shudra : 35-42, 70, 74, 99, 106-10, 112, 119,  
     121-22, 125, 127, 132, 142-143, 147, 150,  
     169-70, 220-21, 230, 242, 251, 266, 275,  
     280-81, 286-81, 286-88, 291-93, 309-20,  
     326-31, 338-41, 346, 350, 353-54, 365,  
     371, 386, 416-25, 428, 430-31, 435, 446-68.  
 Shuka Rishi : 241, 250.  
 Shukracharya : 154, 169, 432.  
 Shwapakas : 170.  
 Sialkot : 237.  
 Siam : 229.  
 Siddhas : 381.  
 Siddharth-See Buddha.  
 Sikhism : 335.  
 Silahara : 231.  
 Sinha Senapati : 450.  
 Sind : 230-31, 236, 238, 326-27, 328  
 Siri : 163, 185.  
 Sishunag : 267-68.  
 Sita : 172, 212-13, 243, 252.  
 Sivi, king : 63.  
 Skandagupta : 242, 251.  
 Skanda Purana : 256.  
 Smith, Prof. Robertson : 13-16, 64.  
 Smith, Vincent A. : 230, 232, 237-38, 248,  
     269.  
 Smriti Dharma : 254.  
 Smritis : 78-81, 112, 114, 323, 332, 378-81.  
 Socialism : 443-44.  
 Socrates : 5.  
 Soma : 52, 154-55, 169, 171, 173, 175, 395,  
     413-14, 419, 424.  
 Soma Yaga : 423.  
 Spencer, Herbert : 86.  
 Srauta Sutra : 248 (Fn).  
 Sruti : 114.  
 Sthanutirtha : 406.  
 Stridhan : 433-34.  
 Strongtyre : 453-56.  
 Stupas : 237.  
 Subha (King) : 221, 398, 422.  
 Sudas, King : 170, 398, 422.  
 Sudeshna : 154, 169.  
 Sukra : 49.  
 Sulabha : 432.  
 Sukanya (wife of Chyavana) : 424.  
 Sumati Bhargava : 240, 270-71.  
 Sumukha (king) : 53, 170, 329.  
 Sunassepa : 58, 404-5.  
 Sungas : 268-69, 274-75.  
 Superman : 71, 77-78, 117, 121, 123-24, 470.  
 Suppiya : 176-77.  
 Sura (wine) : 154-55, 169, 175.  
 Suras (Devas) : 418-20.  
 Surya : 155, 157, 171, 173, 225, 390, 419,  
     427.  
 Susharma : 381-82.  
 Sutas : 255, 383, 422.  
 Sutta Nipata : 175.  
 Synod : 131.  
 Syria : 15.  
 Swayambhu : 112.  
 Tailangana : 233.  
 Taivijja Sutta : 370.  
 Tallyrand : 330.  
 Tamralipika : 63.  
 Tanha : 364.  
 Tantra Vartika : 155.  
 Tathagata : 178-79, 187, 195.  
 Tatvasar sangraha : 240, 245.  
 Tawny Mr. 364.  
 Telang K. T. : 240, 244, 358, 366-67, 371.  
 Tennyson : 87.  
 Theravada : 379.  
 Theragatha : 221.

- Therigatha : 221.  
 Thugs : 90-91.  
 Thurston : 92.  
 Tiele Prof. : 4, 24.  
 Tilak B. G-240, 244, 360, 363, 366-67, 369-76,  
 Tolstoy Leo : 86.  
 Travancore : 232.  
 Trilochanpal : 231.  
 Trikalinga : 232.  
 Tripitaka : 441.  
 Trisanku, King : 55-57, 399-400.  
 Tuias : 139.  
 Tulika : 159, 181.  
 Tukhuras : 49,  
 Tumbhuras : 49.  
 Turks : 273.  
 Turkey : 236.  
  
 Uddyoga Parva : 150, 384-91, 393, 472.  
 Ukkatha : 204, 217-20.  
 Uluka : 391.  
 Uma : 300.  
 Unapproachables : 92.  
 Unseeables : 92.  
 Untouchables : 92, 104, 107.  
 Upakhyavas : 254.  
 Upali : 221.  
 Upanayana : 100-01, 287-89, 424, 432.  
 Upanishads : 7, 81, 84-87, 245-47, 260, 269,  
 369.  
 Upapataka : 83.  
 Upaplowya Nagari : 384, 390.  
 Upekkha : 370, 449.  
 Urvashi Apsara : 50, 53, 291.  
 Usha : 155, 171.  
 Utathya Rishi : 413.  
 Utopian Socialists : 443.  
 Uttar : 382-84.  
 Uttarayana : 373-74.  
 Utgikar Mr. : 244.  
 Uttarmimansa : 247-48.  
  
 Vaidya C. V. : 231, 252, 295.  
 Vaidikas : 234.  
 Vaishali : 450-52.  
 Vaishyas : 99-101, 106-110, 112-13, 119-20,  
 122, 125, 127, 132, 142, 147, 154-55,  
 169-70, 174, 221, 277-82, 286, 310,  
 317-18, 320, 326-28, 330-31, 338-41,  
 348-50, 353-56, 416-18, 421-24, 435.  
 Vaishampayan : 241, 248, 250, 253, 372.  
 Vaishnava : 324.  
 Valenfinionas : 303.  
 Vali : 383.  
 Valmiki : 243, 252.  
  
 Vallabhacharya : 248, 259.  
 Vamacharitra : 254.  
 Vamadeva Vrata : 156, 171, 216.  
 Vamaka : 216.  
 Vamana Purana : 256.  
 Vanaparva : 242, 251, 374, 410.  
 Vanaprastha : 123.  
 Varaha-Purana : 256.  
 Varna : 26, 48, 69-71, 80-81, 99, 142,  
 146-47, 155, 169, 275, 278-79, 285-91.  
 307-08, 315, 319, 326-28, 334, 356, 360,  
 364, 419-22.  
 Varanashram Dharma : 334.  
 Vratyastoma : 425.  
 Varshavas : 451.  
 Varuna : 52, 54, 360, 364, 395, 398, 407,  
 419, 427.  
 Vasistha : 52-60, 155, 171, 216, 291, 329,  
 396-99, 403-07, 413, 422.  
 Vasubandhu : 240, 245.  
 Vashatkara : 392.  
 Vayu : 62, 411, 413-14.  
 Vayu Purana : 256.  
 Vedas : 7, 33-36, 42-43, 46, 48, 60-62,  
 71-74, 78-81, 85, 111-12, 114-15, 118,  
 121-22, 125, 189, 198, 205, 218, 233-34,  
 246, 253, 257-58, 260, 265, 266, 272,  
 278, 280-84, 291, 302, 304, 309-11, 315,  
 318, 321-22, 327, 338-399, 343-50, 354,  
 356, 363-65, 368, 392, 408, 417, 423, 426,  
 431-32, 466-68  
 Vedant : 238, 257-59, 261, 264, 358, 377-78,  
 Vedant Sutras : 244, 247-49, 257.  
 Vedangas : 355, 468  
 Vedic Literature : 245-47, 255.  
 Vedokta : 46.  
 Vena (King) : 48-49, 170, 329, 392-93,  
 426-27.  
 Vessamitta (Vishwamitra) : 216.  
 Viellans : 420.  
 Vichitra Virya : 307.  
 Videha : 37, 63, 258.  
 Vidur : 386-90.  
 Vidula : 389.  
 Vidyadhari : 432.  
 Vijnaneshwar : 294, 313.  
 Vijnan Vad : 240, 245.  
 Vikramaditya King : 253.  
 Vikramsila : 232.  
 Virat : 153, 168-69, 381-84.  
 Virat Nagari : 382-84.  
 Virat Parva : 150, 169.  
 Vireshwarananda Swami : 257.  
 Vishnu : 51, 58, 83, 294, 355, 394, 398,  
 404-05, 419, 427, 468, 470.  
 Vishnu Purana : 52, 255, 256, 263, 396,  
 400, 409, 426.  
 Vishnu Smriti : 294.

Vishvamitra : 53-61, 156, 172, 216, 291,  
 307, 329, 373, 396-407, 410, 412, 422.  
 Vishvarupa : 376, 389.  
 Voltaire : 86, 114.  
 Vrashalas : 242, 251.  
 Vrata Dharma : 254.  
 Vratyas : 350, 425.  
 Vrishni Kingdom : 385.  
 Vritra : 50, 393, 420.  
 Vrihaspati : (See Brahaspati)  
 Vyas : 241, 246, 248, 250, 253, 257, 262,  
 291, 372, 375, 387.  
 Vayu Purana : 256.  
  
 Widow : 431.  
 Warangal : 232.  
 Wasudeo (Arjuna's Son) : 384.  
 Weber Prof : 367, 369.  
 White Yajur Veda : 233.  
 Wide Realm : 196-200.  
 Winternitz : 367, 371, 372.  
 Wilson, Prof. : 367.  
 Woman :—  
     As a gift : 324.  
     As a Slave : 431.  
     Ideal of Life for : 432.  
     In Pre-Manu days : 432-37.  
     Maintenance of : 431.  
     Naming ceremony of : 38.  
     Prevention of—  
         From Freedom : 429-30.  
         From Intellectual pursuit : 431.  
     Punishment for : 431.

Right to—

Re : Marriage : 430.  
 Re : Sacrifice : 431.  
 Re : Veda : 431.

Yadav (Son of Arjuna) : 384.  
 Yadavas : 263, 232, 384.  
 Yadnabhumi : 156, 171.  
 Yadu : 307.  
 Yagus Samhita : 234.  
 Yajna : 174-75, 188, 195, 242, 264, 362-63,  
 365.  
 Yajnakalkya Rishi : 26, 79, 107, 259, 294,  
 319.  
 Yajnyavalkya Smriti : 107, 234, 294, 432.  
 Yajurveda : 277, 429.  
 Yajnikas : 234.  
 Yaksha : 151.  
 Yama : 52, 54, 155, 171, 327, 395, 398, 427,  
 Yamataggi : 216.  
 Yami : 155, 171.  
 Yavana : 54, 397.  
 Yask : 171.  
 Yayati : 156, 172, 291, 307, 412.  
 Yedukas : 242, 251-52.  
 Yudhishtir : 382, 384-90.  
 Yugas : 128.  
  
 Zamolixis : 333.  
 Zarathustra : 75-76, 123, 333.  
 Zenu : 333.  
 Zorastrians : 128.



